DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 348 287 SO 022 244

TITLE	Building Social Work Knowledge for Effective Services and Policies: A Plan for Research Development.
INSTITUTION	Texas Univ., Austin. School of Social Work.
SPONS AGENCY	National Inst. of Mental Health (DHHS), Rockville, MD.
PUB DATE	Nov 91
NOTE	117p.
PUB TYPE	Reports - Descriptive (141)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC05 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	*Educational Development; Educational Policy; Higher Education; Research Administration; Researchers; Research Needs; *Research Opportunities; *Social Science Research; *Social Work

ABSTRACT

There is a crisis in the current development of research resources in social work. The contributions of practice-relevant research to the knowledge base of social work practice lag far behind the growth of the profession and professional education. This report describes the status of research development in social work, summarizes current issues, and makes recommendations for action in professional education, research career development, research dissemination, a support system for research, and a plan of action for research development. A 31-item list of references is included as are three appendices: (1) Task Force Timeline; (2) Annotated List of Studies; and (3) Work Associations and Interest Groups. (DB)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED348287

REPORT

BUILDING SOCIAL WORK KNOWLEDGE FOR EFFECTIVE SERVICES AND POLICIES

A PLAN FOR RESEARCH DEVELOPMENT

TASK FORCE ON SOCIAL WORK RESEARCH

SO 022 244

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

DAVID M. DUSTIN

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

NOVEMBER
1991

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

BUILDING SOCIAL WORK KNOWLEDGE

FOR EFFECTIVE SERVICES AND POLICIES

A PLAN FOR RESEARCH DEVELOPMENT

A REPORT OF THE TASK FORCE ON SOCIAL WORK RESEARCH

NOVEMBER 1991

This report was prepared by the Task Force
on Social Work Research with support provided
by the National Institute of Mental Health (NIMH).
The report does not necessarily reflect
the opinions or recommendations of NIMH.

TASK FORCE ON SOCIAL WORK RESEARCH

Members

Chair
David M. Austin, PhD
Bert Kruger Smith Centennial Professor
School of Social Work
The University of Texas at Austin
Austin, TX

Vice-Chair
Ronald A. Feldman, PhD
Dean
School of Social Work
Columbia University
New York, NY

Glenn Allison, MA
Executive Director
Episcopal Community Services of
San Diego
San Diego, CA

Scott Briar, DSW
Director
Department of Social Work
Florida International University
North Miami, FL

Elaine M. Brody, MSW
Phoenix, AZ and
LaJolla, CA

Claudia Coulton, PhD
Mandel School of Applied Social Sciences
Case Western Reserve University
Cleveland, OH

King E. Davis, PhD
Commissioner
Virginia Department of MHMR and
Substance Abuse Services
Richmond, VA

Patricia L. Ewalt, PhD
Dean
School of Social Work
University of Hawaii at Manoa
Honolulu, HI

W. David Harrison, PhD
Professor
School of Social Work
University of Alabama
Tuscaloosa, AL

Steven P. Segal, PhD
Professor
School of Social Welfare
University of California, Berkeley
Berkeley, CA

Barbara Solomon, DSW
Dean of Graduate Studies
University of Southern California
Los Angeles, CA

Tony Tripodi, PhD
Associate Dean for Academic Affairs
School of Social Work
University of Pittsburgh
Pittsburgh, PA

Betsy S. Vourlekis, PhD
Assistant Professor
Department of Social Work
University of Maryland
Catonsville, MD

Project Officer
Juan Ramos, PhD
Deputy Director for Prevention
and Special Projects
National Institute of Mental Health
Rockville, MD

Blair B. Potter
Editorial Consultant
Bethesda, MD

Technical Support Staff
at the School of Social Work
The University of Texas at Austin
Austin, TX

Patricia Black,
Administrative Assistant

Cora Celia Le-Doux, MSSW
Research Associate

Norris Dean Loeffler, BJ
Editorial Associate

Maura O'Keefe, MSW
Research Assistant

PREFACE

The Task Force on Social Work Research was appointed in 1988 by Lewis L. Judd, MD, then Director of the National Institute of Mental Health. The Task Force has been supported by funds from the National Institute of Mental Health and has received timely and valuable assistance from members of the NIMH staff. **However, this report is solely the responsibility of the members of the Task Force on Social Work Research.** It is not a report of the National Institute of Mental Health and does not necessarily reflect the opinions of the National Institute of Mental Health. The report is also not a report of professional associations in social work, although support from these associations for the recommendations of the report will be essential for their implementation.

In appointing the members of the Task Force, Dr. Judd asked that they examine the current status of research and research training **throughout the profession of social work.** The recommendations in this report call for the expanded development of research resources throughout the profession to address critical practice issues in all fields of practice and at all levels of intervention. However, many of the references to existing research activities and to the potential sources of support for research development deal, in particular, with research in mental health. Key recommendations are addressed to research support programs at NIMH. The report thus reflects the current reality that federal support for research in the practice areas in which social work practitioners are most heavily involved comes primarily from mental health and health research agencies.

One of the major concerns of the Task Force is the need to broaden the base of future support for research in social work to include a number of other federal human service agencies, as well as national foundations, in order to provide resources for the development of critically needed research in all social work practice areas.

David M. Austin, PhD
Chair, Task Force on Social Work Research
November 1991

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This report would not have been possible without the participation of hundreds of individual social workers who responded to survey questionnaires, attended open meetings of the Task Force on Social Work Research, and shared with the Task Force by letter and telephone their ideas about the development of research resources in social work. The leaders of social work professional associations, deans and directors of social work education programs, and directors of doctoral programs provided critically important information. The Task Force is particularly appreciative of the initiative taken in 1988 by Lewis L. Judd, MD, Director of the National Institute of Mental Health, in appointing the Task Force. The broad and ambitious agenda he set forth for the Task Force created an unusual opportunity for the profession of social work. The continued support and encouragement the Task Force received more recently from Alan I. Leshner, PhD, Acting Director of NIMH, has made it possible for the Task Force to bring its work to a successful conclusion.

The work of the Task Force could not have been accomplished without the assistance of staff members of the National Institute of Mental Health. In particular, Juan Ramos, PhD, Deputy Director for Prevention and Special Projects, who served as Project Officer, has been a steadfast source of information and encouragement. Without his active assistance in negotiating the continuous complexities of federal funding over a period of 3 years, the work of the Task Force could not have been carried out. Kenneth Lutterman, PhD, and Paul Widem, MA, of the NIMH Division of Applied and Services Research, also contributed in important ways to the work of the Task Force. The several researchers who carried out a series of contract studies—which were initiated by the Task Force and funded by NIMH—made important contributions to the work of the Task Force.

This report reflects the intense work of the Task Force members during the 10 meetings held over nearly 3 years. Many of the members also served as hosts for Task Force meetings which were held in eight different locations. Differences in perspectives were expressed vigorously, but there was no disagreement about the importance of this undertaking for the future development of social work. Ronald Feldman, PhD, Dean of the Columbia University School of Social Work and Vice-Chair of the Task Force, provided critical assistance throughout the work of the Task Force, particularly in the drafting of this report.

From the beginning, it was clear that the work of the Task Force could not be accomplished without the support of a technical staff. Cora Le-Doux, doctoral candidate, as Research Associate, carried responsibility for the organization of the Task Force office and for developing, administering, and analyzing the surveys coming from the Task Force office. Maura O'Keefe, doctoral candidate, was responsible for several in-house studies and, in particular, for data analysis of the survey of NASW members. Patricia Black, Administrative Assistant, maintained the Task Force records. Norris Loeffler, BJ, as Editorial Associate, carried the major responsibility for the drafting, redrafting, and publication of this report.

David M. Austin, PhD
Chair

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The Task Force on Social Work Research was appointed in 1988 by Lewis L. Judd, MD, Director, National Institute of Mental Health, following a series of meetings with professional associations in social work. The Task Force was asked to analyze the current state of research education, research resources, and research development in social work. The Task Force report describes the status of research development in social work, summarizes current issues, and makes recommendations for action in professional education, research career development, research dissemination, and research infrastructure development.

Social workers have extensive firsthand knowledge about the impacts of critical social and health problems on individuals, families, and communities, and the service programs and social policies designed to help with such problems.Social work researchers over the years have made important contributions to improving the effectiveness of social service programs and social policies. There are today substantial resources within the profession for strengthening the knowledge base of professional practice through research. These include the 135,000 members of the National Association of Social Workers, the 4,000 faculty members in social work professional education programs, including 48 doctoral programs, and the thousands of service agencies in which social workers are employed. The combination of the knowledge and experience of researchers in social work can be a critically important resource in confronting some of the most devastating social problems of our times.

However, there is a crisis in the current development of research resources in social work. The contributions of practice-relevant research to the knowledge base of social work practice lag far behind the dynamic growth of the profession and professional education. This has serious consequences for individuals using social work services, for professional practitioners, for the credibility of the profession, and for the American society. Billions of dollars are being spent for services to deal with critical social problems, including services provided by social workers. Extremely little is being spent on research to improve the effectiveness of such services.

Information from the surveys and other studies carried out under the sponsorship of the Task Force provides information about the critical issues that affect the development of research resources within social work. Although social work professional education programs—baccalaureate and master's degrees—

include required courses on research methods, the effectiveness of such research education is limited by the lack of connections between the teaching of research methods and the teaching of methods of professional practice. Students also have limited opportunities to participate in practice-related research. Doctoral education in social work is marked by very limited sources of financial support for doctoral students and a lengthy educational/professional career pattern which often extends more than 14 years from the beginning of master's degree studies to completion of the doctoral program, with intervening professional practice experience. There also are significant variations in research training requirements among doctoral programs and few opportunities for doctoral students to participate in research prior to their dissertation research. Moreover, in the last decade, there has been no increase in either the annual number of social work doctoral graduates (200) or in the proportion of doctoral graduates from African American, Hispanic, Native American, and Asian-Pacific Islander backgrounds (12%).

The number of social workers involved in research did increase during the 1980s, particularly among faculty members in social work education programs. Yet, the patterns of career development are marked by limited support for research careers within most social work education programs, little use of federal research career development resources, the negative impact of academic tenure and promotion policies on the development of long-term research commitments, a lack of systematic arrangements for academic-service agency collaboration in practice-relevant research, the limited development of knowledge-building networks among researchers, and an absence of researcher/practitioner positions in service agencies.

There has been an increase in research publications, primarily by faculty members in schools of social work. However, there is too little published research that deals with critical professional practice issues and contributes to a cumulative body of knowledge informing professional practice. Moreover, professional conferences, publications, and continuing education currently are not effective in making research-based information available to professional practitioners.

Throughout the profession, there is insufficient organizational support for research development. Only a small number of graduate social work education programs provide systematic support for an active, knowledge-building research program as part of their mission. The National Association of Social Workers and the Council on Social Work Education have not provided systematic organizational support for research development within the profession. Across the entire federal government, none of the agencies that support research dealing with human service issues has a systematic program for supporting the development of research resources within social work.

Nevertheless, the potential for more and better research in social work to address today's social problems is immense. Social workers are prepared to make available their knowledge and their access to service programs for this

needed research to improve the effectiveness of services. Accordingly, the Task Force report recommends a program of action which includes:

- Increased support for research development in social work education programs, including collaborative research partnerships with service agencies;

- Establishment of an Office of Social Work Mental Health Research Development within the National Institute of Mental Health, including responsibility for:

  a program of Social Work Research Development Center awards for schools of social work or consortiums of schools and service agencies, and

  a 15-month Intensive Research Development Workshop for social work researchers in mental health;

- Creation of an Institute for the Advancement of Social Work Research with support from the National Association of Social Workers, the Council on Social Work Education, the National Association of Deans and Directors of Schools of Social Work, the Group for the Advancement of Doctoral Education, and the Association of Baccalaureate Program Directors;

- Establishment of a staff position for research advocacy in the National Association of Social Workers; and

- Establishment of a staff position for research education development in the Council on Social Work Education.

If acted upon promptly, these recommendations, and the others set forth in the Task Force report, will contribute to more effective treatment and care provided by social workers and the improvement of the physical, mental, and social well-being of countless numbers of Americans.

CONTENTS

iii TASK FORCE ON SOCIAL WORK RESEARCH MEMBERS

v PREFACE

vi ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

viii EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

1 SECTION I Nature and Causes of the Crisis in Social Work Research

- 1 Prologue
- 3 The Importance of Social Work Research
- 7 Historical Perspectives on Social Work Research
- 11 The Crisis in Social Work Research

17 SECTION II Research Education in Social Work

- 17 Current Status
- 24 Problems in Research Education
- 26 Challenges and Recommendations

37 SECTION III Research Productivity and Research Careers in Social Work

- 37 Current Status
- 44 Problems in Research Career Development and Productivity
- 45 Challenges and Recommendations

49 SECTION IV Research Dissemination and Utilization in Social Work

- 49 Current Status
- 53 Problems in Resources for Research Dissemination and Utilization
- 54 Challenges and Recommendations

57 SECTION V Support Systems for Research in Social Work

- 57 Current Status
- 66 Problems in Research Support
- 67 Challenges and Recommendations

75 SECTION VI A Plan of Action for Social Work Research Development

- 75 The National Institute of Mental Health
- 78 Professional Associations in Social Work
- 84 Other Federal Agencies
- 84 Social Work Education Programs
- 90 Service Agencies

91 REFERENCES

95 APPENDIXES

- 95 Appendix A Task Force Timeline
- 98 Appendix B Annotated List of Studies
- 105 Appendix C Social Work Associations and Interest Groups

SECTION I

NATURE AND CAUSES OF THE CRISIS IN SOCIAL WORK RESEARCH

PROLOGUE

Every profession depends upon scholarship, and social work is no exception. Scholarship can take the form of critical examination of policy proposals that affect the practice of the profession, development and evaluation of new modes of practice, preparation of textbooks and other teaching materials, and descriptions of individual practice experiences. Research studies that involve the systematic gathering and analysis of information about practice and the conditions that affect practice are a particularly important form of professional scholarship. In the field of social work, the objective of research is to improve professional practice by contributing to the cumulative body of knowledge about effective ways of dealing with critical social problems. Specifically, research in social work involves the study of preventive interventions, treatment of acute psychosocial problems, care and rehabilitation of individuals with severe, chronic difficulties, community development interventions, organizational administration, and the effects of social policy actions on the practice of social work.

The Task Force on Social Work Research was established to examine present and potential research resources within the profession of social work. It was appointed by Lewis L. Judd, MD, Director of the National Institute of Mental Health (NIMH), in October 1988, following consultations with the National Association of Social Workers (NASW), the Council on Social Work Education (CSWE), the National Association of Deans and Directors of Schools of Social Work (NADD), and the Group for the Advancement of Doctoral Education in Social Work (GADE).

In establishing the Task Force, Judd said:

> . . . we are entering an era when all modern and credible human and health service disciplines are increasingly seeing it as their fundamental responsibility to participate in advancing the knowledge bases of those scientific fields that are fundamental to their disciplines. The question is for social work to now become a full contributor to, as well as a consumer of, relevant research (1988).

The Task Force was charged with examining the role of social work research not only in mental health and mental disorders, but also in other areas of social work practice. According to the letter of appointment by Judd (1988), "The focus of the Task Force should be broad, and address the following general

issues with regard to the role of the individual social worker. What is the current state of research in social work? What should be the role of research in social work?"

Accordingly, the mission of the Task Force on Social Work Research was:

> To support the development of research resources within the profession of social work in order to strengthen and advance the scientific knowledge base for professional practice—including direct practice, the design and development of service programs, community development, and social policy analysis, with respect to problems of serious social concern.

Members of the Task Force set up the following framework for its activities:

> Just as professional practice in social work involves many fields of practice which deal with a wide range of critical social problems, so the scope of knowledge-building research in social work is diverse. It entails a variety of interrelated information-gathering and analytic methods appropriate to the research questions being addressed. These research methods include, among others, qualitative and quantitative field research, individual and comparative case studies, historical analysis, analysis of secondary data sources, evaluations of natural experiments, and quasi-experimental and experimental studies.

The Task Force met 10 times, beginning in the fall of 1988 (a chronology of its activities appears in Appendix A). The Task Force initiated a series of fact-finding studies, including surveys of faculty members, research teachers, directors of practicums, and deans and directors in schools of social work; graduates of social work doctoral programs; doctoral students who have fulfilled all requirements except their dissertation; NASW members who are researchers; and a sample of all NASW members (see Appendix B for a list of studies). There were also two studies of research publications in social work journals, a study of research curriculums in doctoral programs, an analysis of introductory social work practice textbooks, and a study of federal legislation that deals with funding for research and research training. NIMH staff members provided information about research and research training grant awards to social work researchers and schools of social work. Information from these studies is included in the body of this report.

Members of the Task Force have talked with officers and members of many social work associations. Written suggestions were received from a number of these groups, which are identified in Appendix C. Five open meetings were held at the CSWE Annual Program Meetings and the NASW Professional Conferences. The Chair of the Task Force presented periodic progress reports to the boards of directors of NASW and CSWE, to membership meetings of NADD and GADE, and to the National Advisory Mental Health Council of NIMH.

THE IMPORTANCE OF SOCIAL WORK RESEARCH

> . . . . A sustained and credible program of research is. . . essential to a profession's self-respect and to its ability to maintain the positive regard of outsiders whose opinions help support and legitimize the profession's endeavors. No profession can afford any equivocation on the importance of research (Fanshel, 1980, p.3).
>
> As never before, social work needs better, more demonstrably effective intervention technologies to use with client populations that present increasingly chronic and difficult problems. Professional practitioners simply require more usable information about what works with whom, under what circumstances (McMahon, Reisch, & Patti, 1991, p. 5).

The benefits of social work research extend beyond the profession itself to society at large. Social workers are one of the largest groups of human service specialists in the United States (there are over 400,000 of them), and they confront some of the most severe and recalcitrant human problems in our society. Among the persons who use social work services are:

- adults with severe and persistent mental disorders, such as schizophrenia;
- children and adolescents with mental disorders;
- adults and children who are the victims of spousal abuse, child abuse, and other forms of family violence;
- families disrupted by conflict;
- men and women addicted to drugs and alcohol;
- individuals who suffer from comorbidity, that is, the combination of mental disorder and addiction;
- children at risk, runaways, school dropouts, and delinquents;
- teenagers with unintended pregnancies and children raising children;
- unemployed adults and families trapped in persistent poverty;
- neighborhoods afflicted by economic and physical deterioration and escalating violence;
- individuals who are homeless, including the mentally ill;
- persons with the HIV infection or an AIDS diagnosis;
- older persons with age-related disabilities; and
- individuals affected by chronic illness or disability.

These human problems inflict pain and suffering on millions of individuals and families. They also place a heavy financial burden on families, communities, and the nation. It is estimated, for example, that in 1989 the cost of direct care for persons with mental disorders in the United States was $55 billion (National Institute of Mental Health [NIMH], 1991, p. 29).

The scope of social work practice has expanded greatly in the last 3 decades in response to these complex problems. It now includes perinatal social work, gerontological social work, oncology social work, psychiatric social work, and

hospital social work, as well as social work services in the U.S. military and in employee assistance programs throughout business and industry. Mental health services are provided by social workers in public psychiatric hospitals, for-profit psychiatric hospitals, community mental health centers, residential treatment centers, psychosocial rehabilitation centers, and private practice. Social workers are essential members of the professional staff in public elementary and secondary schools. They work in neighborhood community development, with immigrants and refugees, in public policy analysis, and as administrators of major governmental and nonprofit service organizations—including nearly one fourth of all state mental health departments.

There is a substantial body of social, behavioral, and biological research on many of the underlying causes of the human problems social workers address. But there are many gaps in our knowledge about "what works"—that is, about the most effective policies and programs to prevent such problems and the most effective means of helping individuals, families, and communities when they do occur. Designing research to determine what works requires both the knowledge and insights that come from experience in helping persons with these problems and mastery of the scientific methodologies necessary to study the complex interactions among individuals, families, and communities that may affect the outcome of services. The *National Plan for Research on Child and Adolescent Mental Disorders* notes:

> The child and adolescent mental health field urgently needs the new knowledge that research can contribute. . . .Given the diversity of research needs and opportunities, no single specialty is likely to be the core; rather, that role probably will be shared among several disciplines. . . .The four 'core' mental health disciplines—psychiatry, psychology, psychiatric social work, and psychiatric nursing—have been, and continue to be, key sources of researchers on child and adolescent mental disorders. . . . Although a broad range of disciplines might provide needed research personnel, the lack of incentives and of well-structured career paths now results in relatively few recruits (U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, 1990, pp. 33-34).

Such research might, for example, take on the questions of what combinations of medications and psychosocial treatment are most effective for severe mental illness; when support for families is preferable to out-of-home care for children who are maltreated; what combinations of economic assistance, training, and personal empowerment are most effective in helping victims of family violence; what combinations of family supports and professional services are most effective in enabling very elderly persons to remain in the community; and how services can be most effectively organized and financed to provide effective care and rehabilitation.

This is not to say that social work research has stood still during the past 3 decades. On the contrary, the scope of research studies directed by social workers has broadened. Most of these researchers are in schools of social

work and most are graduates of doctoral programs in schools of social work. Many of their studies have made contributions to the body of knowledge about the conditions that social work practitioners deal with and to the improvement of practice in a wide variety of service areas. Several of these studies have made highly visible contributions to the development of more effective service programs and social policies. Examples include:

In the area of services for individuals with severe and persistent mental disorders, including schizophrenia, Gerald Hogarty and colleagues at the Western Psychiatric Institute, University of Pittsburgh, have developed and tested new models of family psychoeducation for the care of persons with schizophrenia; these models have sharply reduced the incidence of rehospitalization. Mary Ann Test at the School of Social Work, University of Wisconsin at Madison, and Leonard Stein, also at UW-Madison, have developed and tested a model of assertive community treatment teams, working with individuals with the most severe forms of mental disorder, a model that is being replicated in numerous communities across the country. Steven Segal at the School of Social Welfare, University of California, Berkeley, has demonstrated the reliability of a model of psychiatric emergency evaluation and conducted research in long-term supervised care of the adult seriously mentally ill. Segal, at Berkeley, and Thomas Powell at the School of Social Work, University of Michigan, are currently carrying out research on the role of self-help and peer-support groups in community care for persons with severe mental illness. John Brekke at the School of Social Work, University of Southern California, is developing a model of critical implementation factors in community support programs for persons with severe mental disorders.

In the area of child welfare, the foster care studies over many years by David Fanshel, Columbia University School of Social Work, have contributed to changes in child welfare practice throughout the United States.

In the area of services for families with children who have been abused, faculty at the School of Social Work, University of Washington, and colleagues at the Homebuilders Program and at the School of Social Work, University of Utah, have developed and tested a model of family preservation services to prevent unnecessary removal of children from their families, methods that are now being applied in states and communities across the country.

In the area of income supports, research on child support payments carried out by Irwin Garfinkel at the School of Social Work, University of Wisconsin at Madison, has led to public policy changes at both state and federal levels, resulting in increased income for thousands of single-parent households.

In the area of psychosocial counseling, the development and testing of task-centered casework by William Reid of the School of Social Service

Administration, University of Chicago, and the School of Social Welfare, State University of New York at Albany, have resulted in major changes in the practice of social casework over the past 20 years.

In the area of long-term care, the research of Rosalie Kane of the Rand Corporation and the School of Social Work, University of Minnesota, has contributed to the widespread development of community care alternatives to institutional care. Similarly, the research of Elaine Brody at the Philadelphia Geriatric Center has provided critical information about the impact of care responsibility on family caregivers.

In addition to the expanded scope of social work practice and research, the profession has grown in sheer numbers in the last 30 years. The number of NASW members, for example, rose from 20,000 in 1956 to 135,000 in 1991. Similarly, social work education has burgeoned from 53 graduate schools of social work in 1952 to 117 graduate schools and 400 undergraduate programs today.

Nonetheless, the development of research resources in social work has lagged far behind the growth of the profession and has failed to meet the needs of practitioners, who must work in increasingly specialized and complex areas of practice. There has been no increase throughout the past decade in the number of graduates from doctoral programs, who remain at some 200 a year or about 5% of the current number of social work educators. Also, during the past decade, NIMH—the largest source of competitive awards for research and research training in social work—awarded research grants in these areas to only 18 of the 48 graduate schools of social work with doctoral programs. Furthermore, only 12 social workers are currently receiving NIMH research training support in predoctoral programs and only five social work researchers in the United States are currently receiving NIMH support in specialized postdoctoral research training.

Increased resources are needed for research on a wide array of human problems and conditions that involve social work services. Within the field of mental health, more and better research about schizophrenia and other forms of severe mental illness is needed, as is research on the mental disorders of children and adolescents. According to *A National Plan for Schizophrenia Research,* "A critical requirement exists for training individuals who combine clinical skills with the capacities for rigorous research on mental illness" (National Institute of Mental Health [NIMH], 1988, p. 40). In addition, the National Prevention Coalition, in cooperation with NIMH and the Institute of Medicine, is working to identify the most promising areas of research concerning the prevention of mental disorders and other behavioral problems. As the American Psychiatric Association (APA) has noted in *Psychiatric Research Report,* there is a particular need for research on psychosocial interventions:

Over the past decade, important strides have been made in psychosocial treatment research. . . .The field has also been under increasing pressure

> from both public agencies and private insurance companies to provide evidence of the efficacy and safety of mental health care practices. . . .Yet, there is still a surprising paucity of psychosocial treatment research[,] given the use of psychotherapy as a major mode of treatment in psychiatry, and even more so in mental health generally. . . .A significant barrier to psychosocial treatment research has been the fact that funding in this area has been meager relative to support for research on biological therapies. This is particularly troubling when one considers that psychotherapy research relies solely on government funding, unlike psychopharmacological research, for example, which enjoys enormous additional support from industry (1991, p. 1).

HISTORICAL PERSPECTIVES ON SOCIAL WORK RESEARCH

Research in social work began with the emergence of social work as an organized profession at the turn of the century. The Task Force believes that current issues in social work research are best understood against that background.

Four trends in social work research are particularly important for an understanding of the current status of research development. The first is the shift from research studies located primarily in social service agencies to research studies located primarily in universities, particularly in schools of social work. The second is the development of doctoral education as a research degree rather than as a professional practice degree. The third is the increasing importance in baccalaureate and master's degree programs of research on practice effectiveness. And the fourth is the lack of substantial progress in research development in social work during the 1980s after an increase in the attention given to research during the 1970s.

Early Development of Social Work Research

Social work research emerged from the concept of "scientific philanthropy," which originated in England and the United States at the turn of the century. Detailed studies of household conditions in England (Booth, 1904) and analyses of statistics on household income in the United States (Hunter, 1904) led to the identification of major causes of household poverty. Case records of charitable agencies were analyzed to shed light on the social conditions that led to or intensified individual problems and to guide social policies aimed at specific aspects of poverty. A classic example is the study of deserted wives reported by Mary Richmond (1895). Early college courses, such as the social ethics course taught by Francis Peabody at Harvard University, emphasized social investigation and its implications for social policy.

An important early study was the Pittsburgh Survey (1907) supported by the Russell Sage Foundation. It was an elaborate form of social investigation in which well-known social welfare leaders carried out a series of studies about conditions in that city. One result of the survey, which identified industrial accidents as the most important cause of household poverty, was the movement for workmen's compensation laws. Studies of working conditions of

women in factories were conducted by residents of Chicago's Hull House, and systematic surveys of neighborhood conditions were carried out by residents of other settlement houses. These provided factual information in support of a number of social reform proposals during the Progressive Era. One forward-looking result of these studies was the establishment of the U.S. Children's Bureau as a national center for research on social conditions affecting women and children.

Research and the Development of Social Work as a Profession

In 1904, a full-time, 1-year program of social work training began at the New York School of Philanthropy. Under the leadership of Samuel Lindsey, a professor of economics on leave from Columbia University, the program emphasized education in the social sciences. It focused on analysis of social conditions and design of social reforms, although later its emphasis shifted to training for direct practice. From the beginning of social work education, research training was included in the professional curriculum. The New York School established a Social Research Bureau in 1906. In 1907, the Russell Sage Foundation awarded grants to three other schools of social work (in Boston, Chicago, and St. Louis) to support similar developments. Edith Abbott, first Dean of the School of Social Service Administration at the University of Chicago, emphasized social policy research as a central element of the curriculum. She also initiated the *Social Service Review*, a major publication for social policy research.

Further development of social welfare research continued under the auspices of such organizations as the Russell Sage Foundation and the Commonwealth Fund. National associations of agencies, such as the Family Service Association of America, the Child Welfare League, and the United Community Funds and Councils of America, sponsored research on the organization of social services.

The Social Work Research Group (SWRG) was organized in 1949 with membership open to all persons who had an interest in social welfare research. Researchers were employed largely by councils of social agencies and by individual social agencies. Among the latter was the Community Service Society of New York, which received support from the Rockefeller Brothers Fund for a study of the effectiveness of social casework. In 1956, SWRG became part of the newly formed National Association of Social Workers. One requirement for NASW membership was graduation from a 2-year postbaccalaureate program in social work. This requirement excluded social welfare researchers from academic disciplines other than social work.

Specific attention to researchers within NASW was short-lived. NASW provided staff support for a Council on Social Work Research that had 600 members in 1964, but identification of members by specialty area was eliminated soon thereafter in favor of an emphasis on professional concerns common to all social workers. Thus, recognition of a distinctive network of social work researchers within NASW was ended. Although national confer-

ences on research issues were held from time to time with the support of private foundations and federal agencies, little effort was made by NASW to develop research resources in the profession from the mid-1960s through the 1980s.

During the 1950s and 1960s, attention was focused on research studies that investigated the effectiveness of social services. Early studies were based in agencies, such as the Community Service Society of New York. In 1953, the School of Social Service Administration at the University of Chicago established a research center that emphasized the study of social work practice. In 1956, a similar research center was established at the Columbia University School of Social Work. Beginning in 1956, the first in a series of four national conferences on social work research was held. In 1960, the first compilation of social work research studies was published by the University of Chicago under the title of *Social Work Research.* NIMH provided funds for several of these research studies, particularly after 1956, when Mental Health Project grants were initiated. The Social Security Administration and the Children's Bureau also provided support for studies of social work effectiveness.

Doctoral Education in Social Work

The first doctoral programs in graduate schools of social work were established in 1915 at Bryn Mawr College and in 1924 at the University of Chicago. Both programs emphasized social policy research. The growing number of graduate schools of social work (53 in 1952) became more firmly integrated within colleges and universities during the 1940s and 1950s. Expectations that faculty members have the doctorate led a number of schools of social work to organize a program of doctoral studies. Some of these programs offered a Doctor of Social Work (DSW) degree, which generally was awarded by the professional school of social work. Others offered a Doctor of Philosophy (PhD) degree, which was usually awarded by the graduate division of the university. The curriculum structures of the two types of doctoral programs were relatively similar, however, and both included requirements for dissertation research (Crow & Kindelsperger, 1975).

Research training was an important component of these doctoral programs. Research specialists among the social work faculty often carried the initial responsibility for developing the doctoral program and for chairing dissertation committees. However, the primary objective of these early programs was to prepare experienced social work practitioners to become scholarly teaching faculty rather than to prepare research specialists (Abbott, 1985).

From 1953 through 1955, the CSWE Committee on Advanced Curriculum in Social Work published three monographs that dealt with doctoral education. In 1961, CSWE appointed an Advisory Committee on Advanced Education to examine existing doctoral programs. It reported that "a central objective of a doctoral program . . . is to motivate and equip the student for creative and independent scholarship." A meeting of doctoral program directors led to the 1975 formation of the Group for the Advancement of Doctoral Education in

Social Work (GADE). The purpose of this organization was to share information about doctoral education within the profession through annual conferences. From 1960 through 1980, the number of doctoral programs in social work increased from 10 to 32. Fifteen more programs were established in the 1980s.

Recent Developments in Social Work Research

From the 1960s through the 1980s, research activities in social welfare shifted from community service agencies to schools of social work and their respective universities. As governmental social service programs expanded, councils of social agencies and nonprofit social service agencies narrowed their activities to the direct provision of services. Universities were more likely than community agencies to obtain research funds for evaluating the effectiveness of demonstration projects that were initiated under federal auspices and for studying the effects of national social policies. The long-term effect was to foster the development of research in social work as an academic activity that was separate from the operation of social service agencies. As Fanshel noted, "... formidable institutional boundaries often stand in the way of collaboration between [university-based] researchers and practitioners" (1980, p. 9).

In the 1970s, social work faculty often wrote about issues of research methodology and about the importance of strengthening the research competency of social workers. In 1977, NASW began the publication of *Social Work Research and Abstracts*. In the same year, the George Warren Brown School of Social Work, Washington University, St. Louis, initiated the *Journal of Social Service Research*. In 1991, Sage Publications, Inc., began the journal *Research on Social Work Practice*.

A landmark 1977 Conference on Research Priorities in Social Work Education was held in New Orleans under the sponsorship of CSWE. A year later, a Conference on the Future of Social Work Research was held in San Antonio under the sponsorship of NASW. Both conferences received financial support from NIMH. While these conferences promoted the development of research activities within individual schools of social work, there was little systematic follow-up at the national level by either of the sponsoring organizations. However, six conferences on research issues were held in the period from 1988 to mid-1991, with three additional regional conferences scheduled before the end of 1991. Several of these conferences have received funding support from NIMH.

A major development in the 1970s was the effort to bring research and practice together in professional degree programs by emphasizing the role of research in evaluating the effectiveness of professional practice (Bloom & Fischer, 1982). This effort developed single case study methods to evaluate individual clinical practice. Similarly, it emphasized the use of program evaluation methods in administrative assessments of the effectiveness of agency service programs (Tripodi, 1987). These developments highlighted the growing use of "scientific" research methods for testing new interventions, performing program evaluation and quality assurance, and strengthening and extending the

knowledge base of the profession. In 1986, the National Center for Policy and Practice was established in affiliation with NASW. It houses the Harriet M. Bartlett Database on Practice Research, which contains summaries of published and unpublished reports of research on social work practice.

Since the beginning of the 1980s, there has been an increase in the number of doctoral graduates who are actively engaged in research and publication. Most are faculty members of graduate schools of social work. Their studies encompass a wide range of professional practice fields, but only a limited number of social work researchers are concentrated in any single field. During this period, research studies reported positive results from specific social work interventions applied to specific social problems. Yet, the development of systematic support for research within social work was very limited. Furthermore, federal funding for research education in social work was reduced as part of the general decrease in federal funding for clinical and research training and a shift in the use of funds in NIMH from the support of predoctoral to the support of specialized postdoctoral research training.

At the end of the 1980s, concerns about the future development of research within NASW and other professional associations in social work led to a series of meetings between the leaders of professional associations in social work and the director of NIMH, and subsequently to the appointment of the Task Force on Social Work Research. After nearly 3 years' examination of a wide range of information about the status of research within the profession, **the Task Force has concluded that there is today a crisis in social work research.**

THE CRISIS IN SOCIAL WORK RESEARCH

The critical need to develop research resources comes at a time when the social work profession is expanding dramatically, both with regard to the number of students and practitioners and with regard to the quantity, scope, and complexity of the social problems that confront practitioners. The dimensions of this crisis in social work research are evident in the many materials that the Task Force has reviewed. Some problems are similar to those that characterize the development of research resources in other professions, such as medicine and nursing. And some aspects of this crisis are part of a larger issue involving the role of the university in society. As noted by Derek Bok, former Harvard University President, "Whether you are looking at entire schools, like schools of education, or schools of public administration or social work, whether you look within schools at what is really strong. . . you are struck by what an inverse correlation there is between what society needs from these institutions and what we are taking most seriously. . . .If you take some of the basic problems facing our society and then make a list of all the things that a university could contribute . . . and ask yourself how do all these things rank in the list of priorities of the modern university, one is struck by how low they rank" (*Los Angeles Times*, 1990, p. A-5).

Certain aspects of the crisis in research are, however, unique to the social work profession. Indeed, many of the current problems were identified in the summary report of the 1978 National Conference on the Future of Social Work Research (Fanshel, 1980). These problems involve both the amount of research resources and research production and the quality of the research being carried out; that is, the extent to which the research adds significantly to the body of knowledge underlying social work practice. The responsibility for initiating action to respond to the current crisis rests primarily upon the leadership organizations of the profession and upon others who look to social work for effective service and leadership in dealing with the myriad problems of contemporary life in the United States. The following attributes of the crisis are particularly noteworthy:

• There is a paucity of social work research and researchers in critical areas of social work practice. In this profession with over 400,000 practitioners and 4,200 educators, fewer than 900 persons have published any research since 1985. The research done by these individuals is dispersed across more than 30 different areas of social work practice. The membership in the National Association of Social Workers (NASW) has increased by more than 50% during the past decade (from 80,000 to 135,000). However, fewer than 500, or one half of 1%, of these members identify their primary professional activity as research. Moreover, the number of graduates, from an increasing number of doctoral programs, has remained at some 200 persons a year, for an average of less than 5 persons per program.

• The amount and quality of research in social work are inadequate to meet the profession's need for knowledge. Doctoral graduates publish, on average, only one paper of any type in a peer-reviewed journal every 2 years. The average doctoral graduate makes only one conference presentation every 2 years. Doctoral graduates who teach report that only 15% of their time is devoted to research. Among the research-based articles that appeared in social work journals during the 1980s, more than half were reports of survey studies on nonprobability samples or individual case studies for which neither validity nor reliability could be established. And there have been only very limited efforts by social work researchers to apply for competitive research funds at the national level.

• A critical gap exists between the studies being carried out by researchers in schools of social work and the knowledge needs of social work practitioners and the service agencies in which they work. In fact, this is the problem most frequently pointed out by social work practitioners to members of the Task Force. The current pattern of social work research is determined largely by individual faculty members. Their choices of research topics are shaped primarily by university expectations and available resources rather than by the needs of practitioners or service users. In particular, there is an increasingly serious gap between the educational and research needs of workers in public social services (including mental health services and child welfare/family preservation services) and the curriculums and research in social work educa-

tion programs. Among the unmet needs of practitioners are consistent methods of psychosocial problem assessment, information about the comparative effectiveness of alternative interventions under specific conditions, and guides for the most prudent use of limited resources.

• Current patterns of research dissemination are fragmented and inefficient in getting research-based information to social work practitioners. Only 10% of the sessions at NASW Professional Conferences and CSWE Annual Program Meetings include research-based information. Few continuing education programs present research-based information or research methods. Fewer than half of the conference presentations made by persons who obtained their doctoral degrees in the 1980s have taken place at social work conferences, and fewer than half of their publications are in social work journals. Of all social work journals, only *Social Work* is read consistently by as many as 30% of the members of NASW. Research results appear to be published primarily for other researchers and are shaped largely by criteria for achieving academic recognition.

• There are critical problems in how research is taught at every level of social work education. In general, the teaching of methods is separate from and unrelated to the teaching of professional practice methods. The basic texts used to teach practice methods do not convey information about the relation between research and practice. Indeed, they seldom refer to research-based data as a useful source from which to derive practice principles. Students have few opportunities to participate in "hands-on" research experiences. The majority of programs do not offer formal, structured, or consistent opportunities to do research as part of the practicum. Moreover, state licensing examinations require only minimal knowledge about research.

• There are, in particular, critical problems in the research education offered in social work doctoral programs.

> Requirements that deal with research methodology and specialized research technology, including statistical analysis, vary widely among doctoral programs. Many doctoral graduates and current doctoral students express dissatisfaction with the quality of the research content in their doctoral education. Relatively few doctoral students acquire consistent, hands-on research experience before beginning their dissertation.
>
> Although the number of doctoral programs in social work increased during the 1980s, the annual number of graduates has remained the same. At the end of the 1980s, there were many more part-time doctoral students, and these students were taking longer to complete the degree. While the proportion of women doctoral students and graduates increased to 67% during the 1980s, the proportion of students and graduates from African American, Hispanic, Asian-Pacific Islander, and Native American backgrounds did not increase; rather, they remained stable at about 12%.

On the average, social workers who complete doctoral education spend 14 years from the beginning of their graduate education to the completion of doctoral studies, at which point they are 39 years old. This includes 6 to 7 years of professional experience between the master's degree and the commencement of doctoral studies. Research education received during the master's degree program is usually repeated in the doctoral program. Doctoral graduates do not begin active careers in research until they are in their late 30s or early 40s. Relatively few persons are attracted to such a protracted pattern of advanced study and career development. Accordingly, only some 400 persons are admitted each year to all social work doctoral programs, and only half of that group is likely to complete the degree program.

Financial support for doctoral and postdoctoral students is virtually nonexistent. Nationwide, only 12 predoctoral social work research fellows and 5 postdoctoral fellows are being supported through NIMH. Moreover, when National Research Service Award (NRSA) fellowships are available, they are inadequate (currently $8,800 a year) for midcareer individuals, who may have a family to support. Many potential researchers do not consider doctoral education because of the immense financial sacrifices required. For those who do, the necessity for outside employment further extends the time required for doctoral education and dilutes the effectiveness of such education.

• Existing organizational and funding resources are not sufficient to support research development in social work.

There is no organizational structure at the national level—either within the social work profession or within social work education—that systematically supports and promotes research development.

There is a profound shortage of federal funds for social and behavioral research concerning service programs, technologies, and policies in the critical areas in which social workers are involved.

There is no office within any federal agency that is responsible for supporting the development of research resources within social work. The resources in this area pale in comparison to those available for other professions.

There is no systematic support for research development within most schools of social work.

There is a scarcity of communication networks among social work researchers in professional practice areas.

• Few social work researchers are included in the national bodies that determine research priorities and government research policies pertinent to

social work practice. These include standing Initial Review Groups (IRGs), special IRGs, study panels, and task forces. Also, there are few social work researchers on the staffs of major national research funding bodies, including federal agencies and national foundations.

The crisis in research development in social work comes at a time of intensified debate about the role of research in colleges and universities, particularly about the balance between research and teaching and about the nature of university-based research (Boyer, 1990). It is also a time of increased concern about the gap between what the university teaches and what the larger society needs to know. The 1984 Report of the Task Force on Quality in Social Work Education of the National Association of Deans and Directors of Schools of Social Work emphasized that "knowledge development" is one of the three principal missions of social work education (1986). Derek Bok, writing about the role of research in professional schools, including schools of social work, has said, "The central purpose of all of these [professional] schools is to prepare students for specialized careers and to investigate problems that practitioners have to confront in their working lives. There would be no convincing justification for these facilities if they did not concern themselves primarily with questions of practical interest to their professions" (1990, p. 10).

The social work profession has access to substantial resources within service agencies and professional education programs to respond to this crisis and to support an expanded development of research in both quantity and quality. In the sections that follow, the Task Force lays out the dimensions of the current crisis in research development—research education, research careers and productivity, research dissemination, and organizational supports for research development. A plan of action is proposed to meet social work's need for research and to improve the quality of research that addresses issues in social work practice at the direct service, program, and policy levels.

Key elements in this plan of action are:

- An Office of Social Work Mental Health Research Development in NIMH that is responsible for an expanded program of recruitment, research training, and research career development related to mental health research priorities;

- A program of Social Work Research Development Center awards, including flexible funds for research infrastructure development and support of developmental research projects in mental health;

- A National Institute for the Advancement of Research in Social Work with responsibility for supporting research development throughout the profession in all practice areas with the support of national professional associations in social work;

- A staff position for research development advocacy in NASW and a staff position for research education development in CSWE;

• Improved research education in baccalaureate and master's degree programs;

• Improved research education in doctoral programs;

• Strengthened research support structures in schools of social work; and

• The development of research partnerships between schools of social work and service agencies.

Social work is a dynamic practice profession with a large and growing body of practitioners working in a diverse range of programs—from perinatal services to gerontological services, from prevention and developmental programs to rehabilitation and long-term care programs—and with professional practice methods which include services for individuals, families and small groups, community organization and community development, program development and organizational administration, as well as policy analysis and policy advocacy. There are also more than 500 social work academic programs at baccalaureate, master's, and doctoral levels.

Research—about social problems, about the underlying human conditions that practitioners deal with in everyday practice, and about the effects of particular practice methods—has been an important part of the development of social work and social work education. But today, the contributions of research in social work to the knowledge base of the profession, and to the knowledge base of other practice professions, are severely limited. The development of research and research resources within social work lags far behind the growth of the profession. This can have serious consequences for individuals using social work services, for professional practitioners, for the credibility of the profession and for families, communities, and society. However, the combination of the knowledge and practice experience of researchers in social work can be a critically important resource for confronting some of the most devastating social problems of our times.

SECTION II

RESEARCH EDUCATION IN SOCIAL WORK

> . . .it is no accident that universities have failed to address the issues of poverty and competitiveness more effectively, for universities are captive to the very social values and priorities that caused these problems in the first place. . . .Serious investigation of these issues is expensive, and money must be raised to finance the research. Without a constant and substantial flow of funds, good scholars and students will not be attracted to the field and intellectual progress will be inhibited. Yet in contrast to research in most fields of science and medicine, the money available for research on social problems has fluctuated widely from one period to another. The same is true of funding for schools of education, social work, or human services. . . .Small wonder, then, that the very best students and scholars have turned to other fields where prospects of support seem brighter (Bok, 1990, pp. 42-44).

CURRENT STATUS

The scope of social work education has widened dramatically since the first 1-year program in 1905. Today, there are more than 400 undergraduate and over 100 graduate degree programs in the United States. Some 45,000 students nationwide are enrolled in these programs, and some 17,000 graduate each year. These graduates provide professional services in thousands of public social service programs and voluntary nonprofit organizations, in for-profit corporations, and in private practice. Research training is an integral part of their professional education.

Schools of social work established doctoral programs to prepare experienced practitioners for a variety of functions within the profession. Of particular importance is the training of researchers, whose work can contribute new knowledge to the field and play a vital role in helping practitioners deal effectively with critical social problems. The importance of preparing such researchers has been noted in three recent reports by the National Institute of Mental Health (NIMH) that deal with national research needs.

Caring for Persons with Severe Mental Disorders: A National Plan of Research to Improve Services (1991) notes:

> Mental health services research remains an underdeveloped field, containing only a small number of experienced researchers and few who have a full grasp of the complex systems that affect the delivery of mental

> health services. The development of the field requires a critical mass of researchers who can examine important issues and the creation of training environments that will attract talented investigators (p. 58).

This report also asserts, "Recruitment efforts for mental health services research should focus on attracting a broad spectrum of researchers from such varied disciplines as psychology, psychiatry, nursing, social work . . . " (p. 61).

The National Plan for Research on Child and Adolescent Mental Disorders (1990) notes:

> The child and adolescent mental health field urgently needs the new knowledge that research can contribute. . . .Given the diversity of research needs and opportunities, no single specialty is likely to be the core; rather, that role probably will be shared among several disciplines. . . .The four "core" mental health disciplines—psychiatry, psychology, psychiatric social work, and psychiatric nursing—have been and continue to be key sources of researchers on child and adolescent mental disorders. . . .Although a broad range of disciplines might provide needed research personnel, the lack of incentives and of well-structured career paths now results in relatively few recruits (pp. 33-34).

And the *National Plan for Schizophrenia Research* (1988) states: "A critical requirement exists for training individuals who combine clinical skills with the capacities for rigorous research on mental illness" (p. 40).

Research Education in Social Work Baccalaureate Degree Programs

The objective of the research curriculum in baccalaureate (BSW) programs of social work education is to teach students to be "intelligent consumers" of research (Council on Social Work Education [CSWE], 1974). That is, baccalaureate students are expected to learn how to read and understand research studies so they can apply research results to their own professional practice. The most recent CSWE Curriculum Policy Statement includes the further objective that baccalaureate students learn how to evaluate their own practice: ". . . research should thus provide skills that will take students beyond the role of consumers of research and prepare them to evaluate their own practice systematically" (CSWE, 1988).

Baccalaureate programs typically require students to enroll in introductory courses in research methods and statistics. Courses on research methods are taught largely in isolation from courses on practice methods. According to a Task Force survey of faculty members who teach research, students meet the research requirement in 15% of the current programs by taking an introductory research course in a non-social work department. Curriculum objectives for research teaching were reported as "understanding the research process" (37%), being "able to read research reports" (16%), and gaining an "ability to evaluate own practice" (8.9%). Fewer than half (46%) of the research faculty reported that research experiences occur in the student's practicum. Fully 75%

of the respondents to this survey recommended that changes be made in the research curriculum. The most frequent recommendations were for increased curriculum content in research (22%) and integration of practice and research (18%).

Only a few faculty members who teach professional practice methods also engage in research. Students thus have limited opportunities to participate in hands-on research experiences with faculty members who are actively involved in research. Moreover, while a professional practice degree and professional practice experience are required of all faculty who teach professional practice methods, there is no requirement that they have either research training or research experience. In the state licensing examinations of the American Association of State Social Work Boards, only 3 out of 150 questions for baccalaureate graduates deal with knowledge about research.

There are marked discrepancies among the objectives of the CSWE Curriculum Policy Statement that pertain to the teaching of research, the objectives of many baccalaureate programs, and state licensing requirements. Little opportunity exists for baccalaureate students to experience the actual integration of practice and research. This is particularly true of the practicum, which is the component of the curriculum perceived by graduates as having the most powerful influence on their subsequent professional practice.

Research Education in Master of Social Work Degree Programs

The 2-year master's (MSW) programs of social work education include professional foundation courses, advanced practice courses, and practicums. In addition to the baccalaureate objective of teaching graduates to use research to evaluate their own practice, the master's curriculum must ". . . include advanced preparation in research methods to prepare students for active roles in practice . . . program evaluation as well as in the generation of knowledge for practice, program development, and policy formulation" (CSWE, 1988). There are 117 master's programs in the United States, including those currently in candidacy.

A 1988 survey of the research curriculums in 90 master's degree programs found that the average requirement in research methods was 6.4 hours (approximately two courses), with a variation of 2 to 13 credit hours (Fraser, 1989). One third of the schools without a doctoral program had "minimal" research requirements, whereas only 2.5% of those with a doctoral program had "minimal" requirements. Unlike baccalaureate programs, master's programs did not rely on research courses taught outside the school. Fraser's findings indicate that fewer than half of all graduate programs make use of the practicum as a setting for research instruction; only 35 schools (38%) reported that most students conducted a research project in the practicum. "For many schools," Fraser notes, "the development of a sophisticated research curriculum with opportunities to apply research skills in a supervised practice setting remains an unfulfilled challenge" (Fraser, 1989, p. 16). A similar pattern was found by the Task Force in its survey of master's degree research faculty: only

38% of respondents reported that research instruction was provided in the practicum.

Nineteen percent of master's programs research faculty respondents regarded "understanding the research process" as the primary objective of the research curriculum in their school. Other respondents named "integrating research and practice" (17%), "evaluating own practice" (16%), and "conducting/producing research" (3%) as objectives. Eighty-one percent of the master's degree research faculty recommended that changes be made in the research curriculum, including "integration of practice and research" (21%), "hands-on research experience" (17%), and "increased curriculum time for research" (13%). In the state licensing examinations of the American Association of State Social Work Boards, only 4 of 150 questions for master's graduates deal with knowledge about research.

Like their baccalaureate program counterparts, few master's program faculty members who teach professional practice methods also conduct research. In addition, research courses are largely divorced from practice courses. Thus, master's students are unlikely to find a research-based practice methods course during their professional education, and they have limited opportunities to participate in hands-on research with faculty members who are themselves researchers. Moreover, while a professional practice degree and some professional practice experience are required by CSWE Accreditation Standards of all faculty who teach professional practice methods at the master's level, there is no requirement that they have either research training or research experience.

Discrepancies exist among the objectives of the CSWE Curriculum Policy Statement pertaining to the advanced curriculum for teaching research, the objectives of many master's programs, and state licensing bodies. Students need more experience that integrates practice and research, particularly in the practicum, and they need to be aware of career possibilities in social work research. In the Task Force survey of National Association of Social Workers (NASW) members who are researchers, fewer than half reported that they had received any encouragement from faculty to consider a career in social work research.

Research courses and practicums are not the only places in baccalaureate and master's curriculums where research can be found. Yet, a detailed examination of six introductory social work practice textbooks used widely in graduate and undergraduate programs (Sheafor, Horejsi, & Horejsi, 1988; Zastrow, 1981; Hepworth & Larsen, 1982; Compton & Galaway, 1984; Brill, 1990; Shulman, 1979) revealed that only one deals in detail with research-based information about practice methodologies. Others include limited references to empirical studies or to the use of research methods for practice evaluation. A review of nine community practice textbooks (Mizrahi, 1991) found a similar pattern. LeCroy and Goodwin (1988) reported that an analysis of 188 syllabi for introductory practice methods courses in graduate schools of social work

indicated "that very few courses read published research. . . .Our results revealed a mean of . . . less than one article per course . . . the evidence suggests that only small numbers of empirical studies are actually incorporated into syllabi" (pp. 45-46).

Among recent developments in professional education at the graduate level are post-master's clinical training programs designed primarily for social workers and multidisciplinary training programs that include social workers as students and faculty. The American Cancer Society and the National Association of Oncology Social Workers sponsor a national program of post-master's degree fellowships. These programs, including the Master of Public Health programs supported through the Maternal and Child Health Program of the U.S. Public Health Service, are located in health care and mental health care centers that have active research programs; however, research training is not a major component of these programs.

Research Education in Social Work Doctoral Programs

Each decade since 1960 has witnessed an increase of some 10 doctoral programs in social work, bringing the current total to 48.* Of these programs, 54% are in public universities and 46% are in private colleges or universities. Two thirds of the doctoral programs offer the Doctor of Philosophy (PhD) degree; one third offer the Doctor of Social Work (DSW) degree. Prior studies have reported no systematic differences between the academic requirements for the two degrees, and nearly all doctoral programs identify themselves as offering a research doctorate.

Doctoral programs are the primary source of social work professionals who combine professional education, practice experience, and specialized research training. The majority of doctoral graduates (60%) become faculty members in schools of social work. This section of the report examines characteristics of doctoral programs, doctoral students, and doctoral graduates' careers.

The patterns of doctoral students and graduates in 1989 differed little from the patterns throughout the 1980s except for increases in the proportion of precandidacy part-time students (to 53%) and women graduates (to 66%). The proportion of graduates from Native American, African American, Hispanic, and Asian-Pacific Islander backgrounds remained at some 12%. Ninety percent of precandidacy doctoral students had a master's of social work degree, and an average of 8 to 10 new students enrolled in doctoral programs each year. The average number of graduates declined slightly, to just under 5 in 1989. Doctoral programs continue to increase in number, but there has not been a corresponding increase in the total number of graduates each year, which remains at approximately 200. The lack of financial support for doctoral students contributes directly to an increase in the proportion of part-time students and a longer time for completing the degree requirements.

* The Florence Heller Graduate School of Brandeis University is the only program that offers a PhD in Social Welfare without also offering a master's degree in social work; however, nearly all students admitted to the PhD program during the 1960s had an MSW degree. Since the early 1970s, this program has admitted students from a variety of professional and disciplinary backgrounds; yet, it has the largest number of doctoral graduates with a master's degree in social work. These graduates were included in the Task Force survey of doctoral graduates.

In the Task Force survey of all social work doctoral graduates since the 1960s, 46% reported that geographic availability was the most important factor in their selection of a particular doctoral program. Among these graduates, the average age at completion of the master's degree was 27. They typically entered the doctoral program at age 34 with 7 years of professional experience, and they graduated from the doctoral program at 39. Including 2 years of master's study, the period of graduate education for the doctoral graduates extended over 14 or more years.

Few people enter the social work profession with the primary objective of becoming a researcher. Most enter it with the goal of directly helping others. Thus, the pool of potential social work researchers is largely made up of experienced practitioners. For these people to embark on a course of doctoral study requires a major change in roles. This role change is a little-recognized, but powerful, disincentive for shifting to a research career. In addition, there are few examples of researchers/practitioners in the practice community. The availability of models, mentoring, and professional support for research roles is increasing, but it is still inadequate.

Because most master's graduates practice for 6 to 7 years before they enter a doctoral program, many need to relearn research methods learned at the master's degree level. This further extends the time required for preparation of research specialists. Furthermore, by their mid-30s, many able social work practitioners with good potential as teachers and researchers already have established a professional career and have family responsibilities. Two thirds of the doctoral graduates surveyed were married at the time of their graduation, one half had at least one child, and one third had two or more children. Enrollment in a doctoral program often entails both a major career shift and substantial financial sacrifice. For these reasons, specialized postdoctoral research training becomes an unlikely alternative for all but a very few persons.

Persons considering doctoral education frequently have debts remaining from their undergraduate and graduate studies. National Research Service Act (NRSA) predoctoral awards, now at $8,800 for full-time study for 12 months, are designed for young, single students who enter doctoral programs directly from their undergraduate studies. There are no adjustments for graduate education, professional experience, or family responsibilities. Except for limited dissertation support, there is no systematic federal support for doctoral students in many of the areas with which social work practitioners are involved (for example, child welfare, gerontology). Graduate students in social work, as well as those in other practice professions, are explicitly excluded from National Science Foundation (NSF) pre- and postdoctoral research fellowships.

Since graduate faculty in schools of social work have limited research funds themselves, there are few research assistantships that pay enough to meet students' financial needs. Doctoral students must increasingly rely on outside employment for financial support, thus increasing the number of students who

engage in part-time study. This results in a less intensive educational experience, a relatively high rate of attrition among doctoral students, and a longer period of time before completion of the degree. Moreover, the modest salaries of junior faculty make it difficult to repay debts incurred during doctoral studies.

Students from Native American, African American, Hispanic, and Asian-Pacific Islander backgrounds often face a combination of limited family resources, previous educational debts, and alternative career options in program administration, policy analysis, and clinical practice. Doctoral research education, with its deferred earnings and staggering financial obligations, is an unlikely career choice, given current limitations in financial support. The Minority Fellowship Program, funded by the National Institute of Mental Health (NIMH) and administered through CSWE, is the only national financial support program for such doctoral students. It has provided an average of seven new research fellowships per year for the past 3 years.

Comparing the characteristics of all doctoral graduates since 1960 with current all-but-dissertation (ABD) students, it is evident that the latter worked longer before beginning doctoral education (8.9 years vs. 6.8 years) and were older at the time they began (36.5 years vs. 34.1 years). Only 50% of precandidacy students in 1989 received any form of financial aid, according to reports from doctoral programs. Among ABD students and doctoral graduates, teaching was identified most frequently as the most important career objective, with research as the second most important objective.

Although the announced objectives of social work doctoral programs are markedly similar, programs vary in the priority they actually accord to research instruction and in the competencies they require for research careers. Twenty-two percent of the programs require a recent course in social statistics for admission. Eighty percent require two or more courses in research methods and two or more courses in social statistics. On the average, research courses, including statistics, constitute one third of the coursework required for a doctoral degree. However, about one fifth of the programs require only a single course in research methodology and a single course in statistics, and only a few require four or more research methods courses plus four or five courses in statistical methods. While the introductory research methods course is taught primarily within the social work program (89%), only 49% of the statistics courses are taught within the program.

Most doctoral programs reported teaching only a limited amount of research methodology and statistical knowledge for mastery. Most advanced statistical methods—experimental design, qualitative research, meta-analysis, and organizational analysis—are taught primarily for comprehension, not mastery. Overall, 87% of the doctoral graduates rated their doctoral education as "very good" or "moderately good," although between one fourth and one third of the graduates reported that their program placed "little" or "no" emphasis on specific elements of research education. Among both doctoral graduates and

ABD students, women were significantly more critical of the quality of their doctoral research education than were men.

Forty percent of the doctoral programs surveyed include research experience before the dissertation. Thirty percent of doctoral program directors reported student involvement in faculty research. An average of five faculty members in each doctoral program was reported as involved in funded research projects and four in unfunded research. Half of the ABD students and half of the NASW members who are researchers with doctoral degrees reported some form of hands-on research experience prior to their dissertation research. However, in most instances, the doctoral dissertation study was the first substantial research effort for which the student was responsible. Seldom is the dissertation study the culmination of an extended period of research experience. Further, students had limited opportunities to be involved in the preparation of research grant proposals or the administration of research grants.

ABD students reported that they were conducting their dissertation research predominantly on an independent basis (89%). Research methods varied substantially. Experimental and quasi-experimental studies, surveys, and policy analyses were reported by doctoral program directors as the most widely acceptable types of dissertation research. Among ABD students, 40% reported using survey methodology for their dissertations, while 20% reported using qualitative research designs. Only 17% stated that they had received financial assistance for their dissertation research.

Analysis of doctoral dissertations in social work and social welfare reveals that most dissertation studies have no direct application to social work practice. Some do not even discuss the possible implications of their findings for social work practice (Briar, 1985). Particularly notable, given the pattern of social work practice, is the limited number of dissertations that deal with issues of child welfare and family preservation. This finding is less surprising in light of the scant amount of funded research by doctoral faculty in these areas.

Only four schools of social work had experience with postdoctoral fellowship programs during the 1980s. Currently, only five postdoctoral students are supported in two postdoctoral programs. Such programs require strong and ongoing faculty research in one or more substantive areas, as well as sustained institutional support for research. Mental health and health research sectors of the federal government currently are the only consistent sources of postdoctoral support. On occasion, private foundations support individual researchers in specialized areas.

PROBLEMS IN RESEARCH EDUCATION

Problems in Research Education in Social Work Baccalaureate and Master's Degree Programs

There are several serious problems in research education in social work baccalaureate and master's degree programs. These problems limit practitio-

ners' use of research and of research-based knowledge and hamper recruitment of students to a research career in social work.

• There are major discrepancies between the CSWE Curriculum Policy Statement's objectives in teaching research and the objectives and practices of many social work baccalaureate and master's programs. This is particularly true of practicums.

• There is a critical gap between the teaching of professional practice methods and the teaching of research, and between the teaching of research methods and student experiences with research in the practicum.

• There are significant variations among programs in the objectives of research education and in the competency expectations for students at both the baccalaureate and master's levels. Further, there is little agreement as to whether research education is aimed primarily at comprehension of published research, the use of research methods for evaluating individual professional practice, or participation in designing and implementing research whose findings are more widely applicable.

• There is a lack of research-based knowledge in basic textbooks for social work practice courses.

• There is little or no information for students in professional degree programs about research as a career. Few social work education programs permit interested students to explore a research career by combining classroom education in research methods with a research-intensive practicum.

Problems in Research Education in Social Work Doctoral Programs

The encouraging growth in the number of doctoral programs in social work over the past 3 decades has been undercut by their failure adequately to expand the research capacity of the profession or develop the knowledge base of the profession. There are several reasons for this, namely:

• There is no national focus, other than yearly meetings held by the Group for the Advancement of Doctoral Education in Social Work (GADE), on the development of doctoral education in social work or on the development of research training within doctoral programs.

• There has been no increase in doctoral graduates, corresponding to the increase in the number of doctoral programs, nor has there been any increase in graduates from Asian-Pacific Islander, African American, Hispanic, or Native American backgrounds.

• There is a high proportion of part-time doctoral students who take an unusually long time to complete the degree requirements and, in turn, are less likely to pursue an active career in research.

• The excessive length of the combined master's education, practice experience, and doctoral education severely limits the number of persons who can consider research as a viable career option.

• There are few career researchers in the profession and, therefore, few role models for experienced practitioners who might consider shifting to a research career.

• Financial support for social work doctoral students is severely limited. Reductions in funding for research training in all fields and a shift in funding toward postdoctoral fellowships and research assistantships have had severe consequences for research development in social work; only 12 social work predoctoral research fellows are being supported nationwide by NIMH in 1991.

• There are substantial variations in the academic requirements for research training within doctoral programs. Some programs have minimal requirements similar to those for master's programs, while others have requirements that are more akin to those for doctoral programs in the social and behavioral sciences.

• There are few opportunities for doctoral students to be actively involved in ongoing research studies prior to their dissertation research. In part, this is a consequence of the limited availability of research funds for social work faculty.

Many of these problems are similar to those identified in a report by the Association of Graduate Schools of the Association of American Universities (1990) entitled *Institutional Policies to Improve Doctoral Education.*

CHALLENGES AND RECOMMENDATIONS

These problems in social work education present formidable challenges to the profession. If the knowledge base of the profession is to be improved and the contributions of social work to the solution of critical social problems strengthened, action must be taken. The recommendations set forth below will require action by the Council on Social Work Education (CSWE) and its Commissions on Educational Policy and on Accreditation; the National Association of Deans and Directors of Schools of Social Work (NADD); the Association of Baccalaureate Program Directors (BPD); the Group for the Advancement of Doctoral Education (GADE); individual baccalaureate, master's, and doctoral programs in social work; the National Institute of Mental Health (NIMH); and other federal agencies. Some of these recommendations will require organizational initiatives that are dealt with in more detail in Section V of this report.

CHALLENGE: Strengthen support for research education within the profession of social work.

• CSWE should establish an Office for the Advancement of Research in Social Work to facilitate and promote research education and research development within social work education programs.

CHALLENGE: Strengthen research education in social work baccalaureate degree programs.

• In its next Curriculum Policy Statement, the CSWE Commission on Educational Policy should:

recognize the importance of research education and the production of practice-relevant research in the educational mission of baccalaureate programs; and

recognize the importance of recruiting students who are interested in research and of advising students about research career pathways in social work that can link research education at the baccalaureate, master's, and doctoral levels.

• The accreditation standards of the CSWE Commission on Accreditation should be strengthened to:

support the development of adequate research competencies by all students in baccalaureate degree programs;

require accreditation review teams to pay specific attention to the quality of research teaching and the integration of research experiences into all aspects of the baccalaureate degree curriculum;

promote increased linkage between research teaching and practice methods teaching;

require that all areas of the foundation curriculum, including practice methods, be based on knowledge derived to the fullest extent possible from research in social work and from related professions or disciplines; and

establish expectations for research competency on the part of practicum instructors.

• The American Association of State Social Work Boards should be urged to increase the proportion of questions on licensing examinations for baccalaureate graduates that deal with research methodology and the ability to understand research reports.

• Baccalaureate social work programs should:

increase significantly the attention given to research-based knowledge in the teaching of practice methods and to the use of research methods to examine practice effectiveness;

emphasize the importance of using and producing research that is related to social work practice;

provide opportunities for all students to participate directly in research activities, including academic-based research projects, research projects in practicums, and summer research experiences;

train all students in the use of computers so they can access software programs and data bases that support practice and research activities; and

recruit students who are interested in a research career and provide them with opportunities for a specialized practicum that includes research experiences.

• Baccalaureate programs should make use of the NIMH Minority Access to Research Careers (MARC) program for early identification of persons interested in research careers, including intensive summer workshops and mentoring relationships with active researchers, and the Supplements for Underrepresented Minorities in Biomedical and Behavioral Research Support by ADAMHA.

• Baccalaureate programs should encourage faculty to infuse research content and skills into the professional curriculum by:

giving faculty released time from teaching duties to take additional instruction in research;

increasing recognition of faculty research productivity and of faculty initiatives to engage students in research by adjusting faculty work load standards; and

designing programs of in-service research training for practicum instructors.

• The Association of Baccalaureate Program Directors (BPD) should support the strengthening of research education in baccalaureate programs through faculty development workshops, consultations, and faculty exchanges among baccalaureate and master's degree programs.

CHALLENGE: Strengthen expectations for research competency in social work baccalaureate programs.

• Instruction in research methods in BSW programs should focus on the competencies to be expected of baccalaureate degree graduates. At least the following should be expected:

ability to define practice issues in research terms;

ability to search for and locate research studies relevant to specific practice problems and to employ a variety of computerized data bases;

ability to comprehend and critically evaluate the validity and reliability of research studies;

ability to apply in practice research findings that are relevant to assessment, planning, intervention, implementation, and practice evaluation;

ability, under supervision, to use research tools in practice and to evaluate the quality and effectiveness of one's own practice; and

ability to contribute to the implementation of research activities in service agencies.

CHALLENGE: Strengthen research education in social work master's degree programs.

• In its next Curriculum Policy Statement, the CSWE Commission on Educational Policy should:

recognize the importance of research education and the production of practice-relevant research in the educational mission of master's degree programs; and

recognize the importance of recruiting students who are interested in research and of advising students about research career pathways in social work that can link research education at the master's and doctoral levels.

• The accreditation standards of the CSWE Commission on Accreditation should be strengthened to:

support the development of adequate research competencies by all students in master's degree programs;

require accreditation review teams to give specific attention to the quality of research teaching and the integration of research experiences into all aspects of the master's degree curriculum;

promote increased linkage between research teaching and practice method teaching;

require that all areas of the foundation and advanced curriculum, including practice methods, be based on knowledge derived, to the fullest extent possible, from research in social work and from related professions or disciplines; and

establish expectations for research competency on the part of practicum instructors.

• The American Association of State Social Work Boards should be urged to increase the proportion of questions on licensing examinations for master's degree graduates that deal with research methodology, the ability to understand research reports, and the ability to use research procedures to evaluate professional practice.

• Master's degree social work programs should:

increase significantly the attention given to research-based knowledge in the teaching of practice methods and to the use of research methods to examine practice effectiveness;

emphasize the importance of using and producing research that is related to social work practice;

provide opportunities for all students to participate directly in research activities, including academic-based research projects, research projects in practicums, and summer research experiences;

train all students in the use of computers so they can access software programs and data bases that support practice and research activities;

recruit and advise students who are interested in a research career and provide them with opportunities for either an advanced practice concentration in research which emphasizes the research/practice connection, or a research-intensive practicum; and

make use of the NIMH MARC program for early identification of persons interested in research careers, including intensive summer workshops and mentoring relationships with active researchers, and the Supplements for Underrepresented Minorities in Biomedical and Behavioral Research Support by ADAMHA.

• Master's degree programs should encourage faculty to infuse research content and skills into the professional curriculum by:

giving faculty released time from teaching duties to take additional instruction in research;

increasing recognition of faculty research productivity and of faculty initiatives to engage students in research; and

designing programs of in-service research training for practicum instructors, as well as opportunities for them to participate in collaborative school/agency research initiatives.

• NADD should support the strengthening of research education in master's degree programs through faculty development workshops, consultations, and faculty exchanges among master's degree programs.

CHALLENGE: Strengthen expectations for research competency in social work master's degree programs

• Master's degree programs should include in their admission information the expectation that applicants will have had undergraduate courses in statistics and research methods or be prepared to take a placement examination in these curriculum areas.

• Instruction in research methods in master's degree programs should focus on the competencies to be expected of master's degree graduates, including the following:

ability to define practice issues in research terms;

ability to retrieve from a variety of computerized data bases research studies relevant to specific problems in the student's area of advanced practice;

ability to comprehend and evaluate critically the validity and reliability of research studies;

ability to apply in practice research findings that pertain to assessment, planning, intervention, implementation, and practice evaluation;

ability to use research skills independently to evaluate one's own practice effectiveness;

ability to serve as a research team member and to apply quantitative and qualitative technical skills in research design and analysis;

ability to teach supervisees how to use research methods and findings; and

in master's degree programs that offer a concentration in research, the ability to assume responsibility, under supervision, for research design and proposal preparation.

CHALLENGE: Strengthen research education in social work doctoral programs.

• GADE, in cooperation with NADD, should develop guidelines for the enhancement of research training in doctoral programs, including mechanisms for assessing the quality of doctoral programs and identifying the resources required to establish and maintain quality. It should make this information available to universities with doctoral programs in social work and to universities that are considering such programs.

• Schools of social work with doctoral programs and those considering doctoral programs and their universities should examine issues of quality and effectiveness in doctoral programs, the resources required for developing and maintaining a strong doctoral research program, and the resources available for support for full-time doctoral students.

• Schools of social work should strive to recruit doctoral students earlier in their professional careers.

• Schools of social work should experiment with combined master's/doctoral programs for individuals who have a strong undergraduate background in research. Such programs should include provisions for an extended practice residency during the precandidacy period or following the completion of requirements for candidacy.

• Doctoral programs should increase the rigor and sophistication in their teaching of research methods and analytic techniques and in their application of these techniques to the study of practice-related issues.

• Doctoral programs should employ more researchers from other academic departments to teach specialized research procedures that are applicable to practice.

• Doctoral programs should require hands-on research experiences throughout the course of study, including research practicums, research internships, and research assistantships.

• Doctoral programs should provide students with the knowledge and skills that are essential for obtaining research support.

CHALLENGE: Strengthen expectations for research competency in social work doctoral programs.

• Doctoral programs should apply stringent admission standards and should require MSW-level research competencies as a prerequisite for admission.

• Regardless of their specific program objectives, all doctoral programs in social work should adopt the following expectations for research competency:

ability to select and apply complex research designs;

ability to select and apply sophisticated statistical tools, including multivariate and causal modeling techniques;

ability to design and execute independently complex research studies, including experimental and quasi-experimental designs, organizational, program, and policy analyses, and qualitative field studies; and

ability to write competitive research proposals in the student's specialized research area(s).

• Post-master's degree education programs that include social work students should give greater attention to research training and to opportunities for students to participate in multidisciplinary research.

CHALLENGE: Strengthen financial support for doctoral students.

• NIMH should develop an expanded research career recruitment program, under the auspices of an Office for Social Work Mental Health Research Development, which would:

increase support for predoctoral research training fellowships in social work. Social work requires a substantial expansion of training at the predoctoral level, both to meet the immediate need for researchers and to provide a base for expanding specialized postdoctoral research training;

increase stipends for predoctoral students in an effort to recognize their graduate education and professional experience in social work. Current regulations used to determine the level of stipend support for predoctoral fellows under the National Research Service Act (NRSA) do not recognize the social work student's graduate education, several years of professional experience, and often, significant family financial responsibilities;

support the development of specialized postdoctoral research programs in schools of social work;

issue pre- and postdoctoral research training announcements highlighting opportunities for master's degree and doctoral graduates in social work;

create dissertation grants for research in NIMH priority areas, with stipends of $25,000 per year for up to 2 years and up to $25,000 for research expenses.

• The Administration for Children and Families, U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, should establish a long-term plan for the support of doctoral research education that focuses on research dealing with children, youths, families, and persons with developmental disabilities.

• The Department of Veterans Affairs (VA) should increase the opportunities for social workers to participate in VA research training fellowships and senior research fellowships.

• CSWE, through the Office for the Advancement of Research in Social Work, should seek funding from a consortium of national foundations to support doctoral students who are interested in research concerning social work practice and critical social problems.

• Schools of social work should provide sufficient financial support to make full-time study feasible for all precandidacy doctoral students.

• Schools of social work should be encouraged to use research assistant positions in RO 1 research grants to support predoctoral students at financial levels that are consistent with their educational and professional backgrounds.

• Schools of social work should support the option of the postdoctoral appointment for doctoral graduates prior to appointment as a junior faculty member.

• Service agencies, including teaching hospitals, nonprofit agencies, state departments of human services, and departments of mental health, should provide research practicum experiences for doctoral students.

CHALLENGE: Increase the number of social work doctoral research graduates from Asian-Pacific Islanders, Native American, African American, and Hispanic backgrounds.

• CSWE, through the Office for the Advancement of Research in Social Work, should take the lead in developing a national strategy to recruit and support an increased number of doctoral students from African American, Hispanic, Native American, and Asian-Pacific Islander backgrounds.

• NIMH should triple its current financial support for the Social Work Minority Fellowship program administered by CSWE.

• Schools of social work, in cooperation with the NIMH Office for Social Work Mental Health Research Development, should make special efforts to recruit and retain doctoral students from ethnically diverse backgrounds. These efforts should include provisions for intensive summer research workshops and for affiliations with research mentors.

• Schools of social work should be urged to make use of resources available through the NIMH MARC program and the Minority Fellows program to support doctoral students from African American, Hispanic, Native American, and Asian-Pacific Islander backgrounds.

• Schools of social work should be encouraged to use Supplements for Underrepresented Minorities in Biomedical and Behavioral Research Support and the provisions of the Minority Institution Research Development Program (MIRDP).

To expand the knowledge-building resources in social work, it is essential to strengthen research education within baccalaureate and master's degree programs and recruit students who may be interested in research careers. The improvement of research curriculums in doctoral programs and, above all, the strengthening of financial support for predoctoral students are essential for

achieving a substantial expansion of research resources. New national initiatives to support doctoral research education are critical within both CSWE and NIMH. These are essential first steps toward improving the current pattern of research careers and research productivity, issues which are dealt with in Section III.

SECTION III

RESEARCH PRODUCTIVITY AND RESEARCH CAREERS IN SOCIAL WORK

> To carry out research we need researchers—talented men and women willing and able to solve these problems [understanding children and adolescent mental disorders]. At present, far too few are committed to such studies. We must find ways to attract them, equip them with the knowledge and technology to place them at the forefront of science, and keep them devoted to the task of understanding the mental disorders that make our young people ill (National Institute of Mental Health [NIMH], 1990, p. xiii).

CURRENT STATUS

More than 3,000 persons have graduated from social work doctoral programs in the past 3 decades. Many of them serve in professional leadership positions, including executives of both public and private service agencies and deans and directors of social work education programs. Nearly two thirds of these doctoral graduates have become faculty members in schools of social work and are involved in a wide variety of scholarly activities, including research. Other doctoral graduates, together with a small number of individuals with master's degrees, have pursued research careers in service agencies at federal, state, and local levels. Social work researchers are active in at least 30 different areas, reflecting the diversity of the field. Support for their research comes from local foundations, state human services agencies, national foundations, and a number of federal agencies. Their research findings have led to presentations at an increasingly diverse range of professional conferences and to publications in a growing array of professional journals.

The scale of social work research pales, however, in comparison to the growth of social work services and the complexity of the social problems that practitioners deal with daily. In addition, only a few social work researchers regard research as their primary professional responsibility.

This section examines research career development and research productivity among social work doctoral graduates, faculty members in schools of social work, and members of the National Association of Social Work (NASW) who have identified themselves as researchers (hereafter referred to as NASW researchers). The findings are based on survey data collected by the Task Force (see Appendix B). Barriers to expanded development of research careers in social work are identified and recommendations for action are set forth.

Research Careers and Productivity

A career in social work research may entail participation in empirical studies which add to the knowledge base of the profession, presentations of findings at conferences, and publication of research results in peer-reviewed journals. The information about research careers that appears in this section pertains primarily to social workers who have had professional education at the master's level, subsequent practice experience, and research education at the doctoral level. Research career options for these individuals are essentially limited to teaching positions in schools of social work and organizational research positions which generally entail internal administrative studies and program evaluations. Largely missing from their list of options are **researcher/practitioner** positions in service agencies (with responsibility for conducting fundamental research on practice issues) and **research scientist** positions in schools of social work (for faculty members with long-term research funding).

The accreditation process of the Council on Social Work Education (CSWE) essentially requires faculty members who teach any type of social work practice methods to have a master's degree and significant professional practice experience prior to their doctoral education. Thus, many doctoral graduates begin an academic career in their late 30s or early 40s and do not achieve tenure until their mid-40s. Postdoctoral research training further extends the preparation period.

Social work practice emphasizes a person-in-environment framework. This perspective focuses on complex interactions among social systems which present special challenges in the design and development of research and in the analysis of data. While aware of the complexities that affect a given service program, the researcher often has little control over critical analytic variables.

Faculty members are expected to conduct research that will be accorded favorable recognition by colleagues in other departments of the university and that is of sufficient quality and importance to be published in peer-reviewed journals. Academic tenure policies frequently reward short-term published studies more than long-term investigations about significant professional issues. Practice problems that require longitudinal analysis are especially difficult for single faculty researchers to address within the time frame that is normally available for achieving tenure. This problem is compounded by the limited research support available to junior faculty in schools of social work.

Altogether, 1,548 currently employed persons responded to a Task Force survey of social work doctoral graduates. In general, their first experience as a principal investigator for a funded research project occurred in their late 30s, when they were finishing their doctoral studies. Publication of their first peer-reviewed journal article took place at about the same time. At graduation, their career objectives were primarily teaching (75%) and research (61%). The majority of doctoral graduates (60%) took positions in academic settings. They served as junior faculty in their early 40s, and acquired tenure in their mid- to late 40s. Doctoral graduates who are employed in academic settings report that

they are engaged in direct classroom teaching about 24% of the time; they devote less time to academic administration (17%) and to research (15%).

Doctoral graduates and faculty members in schools of social work are distributed equally between men and women. Almost two thirds of the faculty members who responded to the Task Force survey were tenured. More men than women were in tenured positions. In contrast, there were more women than men in junior faculty positions and among recent doctoral graduates.

NASW researchers, who constitute less than 5% of the total NASW membership, work primarily in academic positions (50%) or in other organizations (29%). Thirteen percent are employed in federal agencies Forty-three percent of the NASW researchers have doctoral degrees in social work, while 45% have only the master's degree. Seventy-two percent of NASW researchers reported having had research experience in their master's degree program.

Ninety percent of social work faculty members reported some involvement in research during the past 5 years. Eighteen percent stated that their research had led to a published article. Sixty percent of the 644 faculty curricula vitae examined by the Task Force showed some research activity since 1980; however, only one third of all faculty respondents reported that they "bought out" or were given time off from teaching to conduct research during 1988-89.

Forty-six percent of the doctoral graduates viewed themselves as "moderately involved" or "very involved" in contributing to the knowledge base of the profession. Those who viewed themselves as "more involved" in the "development of knowledge for social work practice" had higher levels of scholarly productivity* than other doctoral graduates. Rates of scholarly productivity among all doctoral graduates did not differ significantly between men and women or among persons of different ethnic backgrounds.

Sixty-nine percent of all doctoral graduates and 80% of doctoral graduates now in academic settings reported that they had published at least one peer-reviewed article. Twenty percent of all doctoral graduates had no published articles. Sixteen percent of all doctoral graduates—and 45% of those in academic settings—reported publishing six or more articles. Seventeen graduates reported that they had published 50 or more peer-reviewed articles. The articles published by doctoral graduates were distributed almost equally between social work and non-social work journals.

About one third of the doctoral graduates reported that they had made presentations at six or more conferences, one third had made presentations at one to five conferences, and one third had made no conference presentations since earning the doctorate. Twenty-two percent of the doctoral graduates had published at least one book, 15% had edited at least one book, and 43% had written a chapter in a book. Nearly 50% of the doctoral graduates had held an office in a research or professional organization.

* Scholarly productivity was analyzed by examining seven different types of conference presentations and publications, with the number of such presentations and publications divided by the number of years since graduation. Scholarly productivity included research-based presentations and publications and other forms of professional scholarship.

Productivity rates of persons who graduated from doctoral programs in the 1970s and 1980s were comparable; however, 1980s graduates had distinctly higher rates of presentations at non-social work conferences and of publications in non-social work journals. 1980s graduates also outproduced 1960s graduates on these two measures; however, 1960s graduates had a higher rate of publication in social work journals.

Five percent of the doctoral graduates reported that, from all sources, they had received funding for 10 or more research grants since receiving their doctorate; 40% reported that they had received funding for one to five research grants and 46% had had no research funded. The average for all doctoral graduates was less than one research proposal funded every 2 years. However, 1980s graduates reported a funding rate which is nearly twice that of earlier graduates. This may mean that more recent graduates are both more active and more effective in seeking research funding. The pressure of academic tenure requirements may also be a contributing factor.

Doctoral graduates who were productive in one area (for example, conference presentations) also tended to be productive in others (for example, published articles). Individuals with high rates of scholarly productivity were more likely to have published their dissertation research, had research as a career objective when they finished their doctoral studies, taken fewer years to complete the doctoral degree, and served as a peer reviewer for a professional journal.

Among doctoral graduates who worked in nonacademic settings, research productivity was associated with being younger at the time of entering a doctoral program, having held a postdoctoral research appointment, and having had research as their career objective. Doctoral graduates who worked in academic settings had higher productivity rates for conference presentations and publications than those who worked in other settings, and their productivity was directly reflected in the number of research projects for which they had received funding.

The highest productivity rates were reported by 1980s graduates whose interest in research began during undergraduate or master's degree studies. Slightly more than half of the respondents who had published in a peer-reviewed social work journal indicated that their interest in research was stimulated before they began doctoral education.

About 16% of the doctoral graduates were from African American, Hispanic, Asian-Pacific Islander, or Native American backgrounds. Those with an interest in continued research training helped to form such groups as the Asian-Pacific Islander Faculty Association, the Hispanic/Latino Faculty Association, the Black Educators Association, and the Research Council of the National Association of Black Social Workers.

Practice and policy issues that directly affect the lives of individuals and households of African American, Hispanic, Native American, or Asian-Pacific

Islander backgrounds have received little systematic attention in traditional social and behavioral research. Yet, multiple dilemmas face potential social work researchers from these ethnic backgrounds. Graduates of master's programs are aggressively recruited by service agencies, many of which serve substantial numbers of persons from the graduate's ethnic background. Such career opportunities, together with the limited financial resources available for the support of doctoral students, have contributed to the low number of persons from these backgrounds who enter and graduate from doctoral research programs and who, in turn, become faculty members in schools of social work. In addition, in many research areas there is limited financial support for studies that deal with ethnic minority populations. Once employed in academic programs, such faculty members are often called upon to carry a number of special responsibilities, including advising students from similar backgrounds and serving on university-wide task forces.

Productivity rates of doctoral graduates vary by doctoral program. Graduates of some programs reported an average of nearly two publications or presentations per year since graduation, while graduates of other programs had an average of one presentation or publication every 5 years. Graduates from only six programs attained an average of one or more publications or presentations per year since earning the doctorate. The graduates of some programs reported four times as many publications in non-social work journals as in social work journals. Others were published in social work journals at twice the rate at which they were published in non-social work journals. Altogether, 16 doctoral programs had graduates whose publication rates in non-social work journals were greater than their corresponding rates in social work journals.

In addition to its surveys, the Task Force had information about the authors of research-based articles that have appeared in social work journals, information about research activities from faculty vitae, information from the survey of NASW researchers, and information gathered by Task Force staff members about current research activities. From these several sources, a composite data file was created of social work researchers during the 1980s.

Fifty-five percent of the 802 entries in the data file are women and 45% are men. Sixty-four percent of the authors or principal investigators were affiliated with graduate schools of social work, 13% with research agencies, and 9% with undergraduate social work programs. The major research subject areas were social work practice, child welfare, mental health/life cycle, social work education, minority populations, marriage and family, and elderly/gerontology.

In sum, there is a great deal of variation in the scholarly productivity of the graduates of social work doctoral programs. A relatively small group of individuals have a consistent record of funded research, conference presentations, and publications in peer-reviewed journals. Graduates from the 1980s have a stronger record of scholarly productivity than those from earlier periods. Social workers who are active in research are predominantly located in academic settings, with many of them beginning their research activities

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

only in their late 30s and early 40s. A majority of recent graduates and active researchers are women. The proportion of graduates and active researchers from Hispanic, African American, Native American, and Asian-Pacific Islander backgrounds has not increased during the past decade.

The areas of research interest are very diverse, with a small number of researchers in any given area. An increasing number of the conference presentations and publications by recent graduates are taking place at non-social work conferences and in non-social work journals. The nature of university requirements, the pressures of teaching, and the limited funding for social work research are factors that restrict the development of research careers among doctoral graduates.

Characteristics of Social Work Research Publications

The Task Force commissioned two studies to analyze the characteristics of research publications in major social work journals from 1977 through 1988 and in an additional eight journals from 1985 through 1988 (see Appendix B). Articles were identified that had a social work author and that were based on empirical research. "Empirical" included ethnographic reports and clinical case studies that had a clear methodology and identifiable variables, as well as studies that employed quantitative forms of analysis. A total of 1,578 articles in 32 different research areas met these criteria.

Of the journals examined, the highest proportions of articles based on empirical research were in *Social Work Research and Abstracts* (75%) and the *Journal of Social Service Research* (83%). *Social Work* had a much lower percentage of such articles (39%), but because it published more articles overall than any other journal, it had the highest number of empirical articles during the periods studied. By the mid-1980s, more than half of the empirical articles included effectiveness measures or outcome variables, a substantial increase over the late 1970s and early 1980s. Some 50% of the articles based on empirical research involved studies of direct practice with individuals, families, or groups. Smaller proportions dealt with social policy research (20%) or social administration research (20%).

The information from one of the analyses of research publications has been summarized as follows by the study director:

> There are several characteristics of the problem areas and issues addressed by the research articles that are noteworthy. The first is simply the number and variety of problems and issues addressed in the articles. . . .The second characteristic. . .is the relatively small number of articles that address any single topic. . . .A third characteristic is that the proportions of articles addressing each [topic] have remained constant over the 12-year period. . .74% of the articles report results for nonrepresentative samples. This suggests that there are threats to the external validity of three fourths of the studies published in the 12-year period. . .survey designs have consistently dominated the research reported in these

> journals. . . .The second most popular design is the case study or field study. . . .Together, these designs are used in 76% of the research articles and are the designs that exercise the least control over threats to internal validity. The two designs that are able to control for the most threats to internal validity, experimental and quasi-experimental designs, account for only 13% of the reported studies. This finding is bothersome in light of the emphasis in these articles on direct practice and on outcome and effectiveness. This means that conclusions about outcome or effectiveness of direct interventions are bring drawn from some studies that fail to control for threats to internal validity. . . .Over 40% of the articles report only descriptive statistics or univariate inferential analyses with one independent variable. These simplistic techniques include many pitfalls when coupled with designs that have low internal and low external validity. . . .The research reported in the articles can be summarized as collecting primary data (78%) from nonrepresentative samples (74%) using survey designs (63%) and using the person as the unit of analysis (60%) (Glisson, 1990).

Authors of the other analysis state:

> Relative to other professions, social workers appear to publish proportionately fewer empirically based reports. . . .When they do publish empirically based reports, the methods that social workers use reflect little mastery of basic scientific methods, especially the use of experimental design and advanced statistics. For a practice-oriented profession, we find the dearth of experimental and quasi-experimental methods puzzling (Fraser & Taylor, 1990).

Patterns of Productivity Among Social Work Education Programs

Most social work researchers, research studies, and research publications are identified with academic institutions. A sizable number of social workers are engaged in the research activities of governmental and nonprofit service organizations, but these researchers have not, in general, published research reports that are widely available to professional practitioners or other researchers. Only some 10% of the researchers in the Task Force's composite data file are affiliated with direct service agencies.

Smaller numbers of researchers with a social work background are employed in specialized research institutes or research centers, including those sponsored by a school of social work, another academic unit, or other nonprofit or for-profit organizations. While the Task Force identified 134 such research centers, only 63 of them provided information about their research activities. The researchers in these centers, however, represent only a small portion of all social work researchers.

Accordingly, the Task Force analysis of patterns of research productivity concentrated primarily on the work of social work faculty. It has revealed the following:

• Research activities that resulted in peer-reviewed publications are more numerous among faculty members of graduate social work programs than among faculty of undergraduate programs; nevertheless, individual undergraduate faculty members report a pattern of involvement in research that is generally similar to that reported by graduate faculty.

• With some exceptions, research studies that resulted in peer-reviewed publications are more numerous among graduate schools with a doctoral program than among those without one.

• Research studies, research publications, and competitive research awards from federal sources or national foundations are most numerous at a limited number of graduate schools. These represent about one fourth of the schools with doctoral programs. An additional one fourth of the schools with doctoral programs have a significant level of scholarly activity, but few national research awards or research-based publications.

PROBLEMS IN RESEARCH CAREER DEVELOPMENT AND PRODUCTIVITY

Current patterns of research career development and scholarly productivity have created serious problems in social work. These problems limit the contributions of social work research to the development of the knowledge base of the profession; in turn, they adversely affect the quality of social work practice.

• There is limited recognition of the potential benefits for the profession of research career development and research productivity and of the current constraints on such development.

• There is no systematic program for the development of research resources or the support of research careers in social work.

• Only a small number of social work doctoral graduates and faculty members are actively engaged in careers that create and disseminate new knowledge concerning critical issues in professional practice at the clinical, program, and policy levels.

• The very extended preparation period for doctoral education in social work often results in doctoral graduates beginning their research careers in their late 30s or early 40s. Doctoral graduates beginning a research career must often compete for major funding against researchers of similar age from other disciplines who already have a decade or more of specialized research experience.

• Many aspects of professional school work loads adversely affect research productivity, specifically: heavy teaching loads, courses that require intense personal involvement with students, committee work and the supervision of practicums, and rigorous university-wide requirements for promotion.

• The social work researcher usually receives minimal institutional assistance in coordinating service agencies, service providers, and service users, developing multidisciplinary research teams, or performing the complex analytic procedures required for significant research that can advance social work practice.

• Careers in social work research are confined primarily to the teacher/researcher or the agency-based researcher who conducts internal programmatic or administrative studies. Largely missing are the agency-based researcher/practitioner, who may be a member of a combined academic/agency research team, and the academically based research scientist, whose primary responsibility is leadership in conducting fundamental research and in the preparation of future researchers through pre- and postdoctoral training.

• While NIMH supports both research scientist development awards and 5-year research scientist awards to enable researchers to apply at least 80% of their time to research, none of these awards has gone to researchers in social work.

• Disappointingly few persons from Hispanic, Asian-Pacific Islander, Native American, and African American backgrounds have graduated from doctoral programs and subsequently established research careers.

• There are few networks to help individual researchers acquire information about ongoing research or about opportunities for research support. The absence of such networks is one of the major roadblocks for beginning researchers.

Other professions have faced similar difficulties in stimulating research careers. A recent report of the Institute of Medicine entitled *Research on Children and Adolescents with Mental, Behavioral, and Developmental Disorders* (1989) highlights related concerns regarding the limited number of child psychiatrists who are research specialists and it urges action to increase the number of such research specialists. Similarly, the American Psychiatric Association has called attention to "the relatively limited number of psychiatrists actively engaged in psychosocial research" (1991, p. 1). Copp (1984) surveyed the deans of nursing schools about factors that facilitate research and concluded that administrative encouragement, research funding, lower teaching demands, access to conferences, and having significant numbers of colleagues with research training are important factors. Waller et al. surveyed faculty in allied health programs and discovered that "major barriers to research included the undervaluing of research relative to education and service, the lack of financial and administrative support, the absence of professional resources, and the generally low priority given to research" in their settings (1988, p. 101). These findings also apply to social work.

CHALLENGES AND RECOMMENDATIONS

These problems in research productivity and career development present serious challenges to the profession of social work. Prompt and effective action

is imperative if we are to improve the knowledge base of the profession and strengthen the contribution of social work to the resolution of critical social problems. The recommendations set forth below will require action by the National Association of Social Workers (NASW), the Council on Social Work Education (CSWE), individual schools of social work, the National Institute of Mental Health (NIMH), and other federal research agencies. Some of these recommendations will require organizational initiatives that are dealt with in more detail in Section V.

CHALLENGE: Increase substantially the number of productive social work researchers through NIMH support for career development.

• NIMH, through the Office of Social Work Mental Health Research Development, should develop a multiyear plan for substantially increasing the number of career researchers in social work who are engaged in mental health research by:

establishing a program of Social Work Research Development Center (SWRDC) awards;

establishing an Institute for the Advancement of Research in Social Work under the sponsorship of professional associations in social work;

establishing an expanded recruitment program for career researchers;

establishing an expanded career development program for social work researchers which would:

create a 15-month mental health research methodology workshop with intensive summer sessions in 1992 and 1993 and interim meetings during the winter of 1992-93;

set up specialized conferences for faculty researchers and researchers/practitioners that address specific NIMH priorities and represent academic/agency collaborations;

promote the First Independent Research Support and Transition (FIRST) awards;

promote the Scientist Development Award for Clinicians that is available for social workers who have substantial clinical experience and who want to conduct research on mental health issues that are related to social work practice;

create within 4 years a K-12 career development program in social work that is similar to the K-12 program in psychiatry;

promote the Research Scientist Development Award and the Research Scientist Award; and

establishing an intensified research career development program directed toward persons with master's degrees and professional experience who come from Hispanic, Asian-Pacific Islander, African American, and Native American backgrounds. These efforts should include stimulating applications for Minority Access for Research Careers faculty grants, FIRST awards, individual postdoctoral fellowships, and the Scientist Development Award for Clinicians.

CHALLENGE: Increase the number of productive social work researchers through career development support from federal agencies other than NIMH.

• Institutes in the National Institutes of Health (for example, the National Institute on Aging), as well as the National Institute on Drug Abuse and the National Institute on Alcoholism and Alcohol Abuse, should develop systematic programs of support for research career development in areas of social work that coincide with their research priorities.

• The Administration for Children and Families of the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services should develop a systematic program of research career development in social work focused on research dealing with children, youths, families, and persons with developmental disabilities.

CHALLENGE: Increase the recognition and support accorded to research career development and research productivity within the profession through establishment of a National Social Work Research Institute supported by the National Association of Social Workers, the Council on Social Work Education, the National Association of Deans and Directors of Schools of Social Work, the Association of Baccalaureate Program Directors, and the Group for the Advancement of Doctoral Education.

• The primary objectives of the Institute, in cooperation with the sponsoring organizations, would be to:

initiate a sustained national program to educate the profession about the emerging crisis in social work research and the importance of research to the future strength, advancement, credibility, and influence of the profession;

establish for researchers in academic and service settings a program of intensive research development workshops that would address NIMH research priority areas and other priority areas of social work research;

support the development and maintenance of information-sharing networks among researchers in academic settings and service agencies;

provide technical assistance to faculty members in schools of social work in the design and preparation of research proposals;

provide training and technical assistance to schools of social work to bring research and practice together;

develop a national social work research information data base; and

prepare, together with NASW and CSWE, specific proposals for research development workshops in connection with the NASW Professional Conference, the CSWE Annual Program Meeting, and other meetings.

CHALLENGE: Increase support of research career development by schools of social work.

• Schools of social work, and the colleges and universities in which they are located, should develop faculty research career policies and procedures that promote growth in practice-relevant research and in the scientific knowledge base of the profession.

• Schools of social work and social service agencies should create jobs for teachers/researchers and researchers/practitioners.

• Schools of social work should make maximum use of available minority supplements to include such researchers in existing federally funded research projects.

• Schools of social work should establish faculty positions that are identified as research scientist positions for researchers who have long-term research support.

Systematic support for research career development and for increased research productivity is essential to strengthen the knowledge base of the social work profession and to improve the quality of service. However, the production of significant research must be accompanied by systematic dissemination of findings and by their application in professional practice. Section IV examines current patterns of dissemination and utilization and sets forth recommendations for improvement.

SECTION IV

RESEARCH DISSEMINATION AND UTILIZATION IN SOCIAL WORK

> A major effort is also needed to enhance the usefulness of research knowledge once it becomes available. Communicating with service providers and policymakers must go beyond the normal scientific practice of publishing in peer-reviewed journals. . .(National Institute of Mental Health [NIMH], 1991, p. viii).

CURRENT STATUS

Social workers need to know what environmental conditions affect users of services and about the differential effects of alternative clinical interventions, service programs, and social policies. This knowledge is indispensable for effective social work practice. Quality social work research can add to this knowledge, but only to the extent that it is recognized and applied.

There are many audiences for social work research in addition to social work practitioners. These include social work educators and students; program administrators; practitioners in other human service professions; researchers and teachers in other disciplines; policymakers at local, state, and federal levels; the general public; and public and private funders. Efforts to make research-based knowledge readily accessible should take this diversity of audiences into account. However, the primary aim of social work research must be to enhance social work practice at the direct service, program, and policy levels. For this reason, professional practitioners constitute the most important audience for research-based information and dissemination efforts must be directed primarily toward them.

Channels for the dissemination of research-based knowledge include professional conferences, journals and books, continuing education programs, and practice textbooks. Specialized field-of-practice associations are less structured, but potentially important, channels for the dissemination of research-based information to professionals.

During the past 2 decades, several new journals have been established in the profession, including three journals specializing in social work research. The scope of professional conferences sponsored by the Council on Social Work Education (CSWE) and the National Association of Social Workers (NASW) has expanded. Increasing numbers of social work practitioners participate in multidisciplinary conferences in specialized fields of practice and read journals in those fields. Schools of social work and state chapters of NASW sponsor an increasing number of continuing education programs. Yet, the Task Force has

found that dissemination and utilization of research within social work is widely dispersed and of uneven quality. The available mechanisms are of limited value for practitioners.

Written commentaries from field-of-practice associations and from national associations of service agencies (see Appendix C) point to a critical gap between current research activities in social work and the knowledge needs of practitioners. This gap is caused, in part, by the lack of systematic communication between researchers and practitioners regarding the substantive issues to be examined through research, the procedures to be followed in studies within community settings, the forms and schedules of research reporting to be used, and the best ways to apply research findings to practice.

Currently, reports and analyses of research are disseminated through conventional academic publications and traditional modes of presentation, such as conferences. These are important sources of information for teachers and fellow researchers, but they are not as useful to professional practitioners and researchers in practice settings. Research findings that involve specialized statistical procedures may not be readily understood, implications for practice are often lacking or not clearly explained, and the findings of individual research studies may tell more about what does not work than about what does succeed. At the same time, as noted in Section III, faculty researchers often face funding constraints, academic pressures for particular forms of scholarship, and their own reluctance to deal with the time-consuming, uncertain ties associated with building collaborative research partnerships with service agencies.

Conferences and Publications

Two national conferences are organized regularly by official professional bodies: the Professional Conference of NASW and the Annual Program Meeting of CSWE. The CSWE meeting is the major means through which faculty members acquire information about research on new practice developments for use in the classroom. Conferences are also sponsored regularly by national associations of service agencies, such as the Child Welfare League and the American Public Welfare Association, and by specialized field-of-practice associations, such as the Oncology Social Workers, the Association for the Advancement of Social Work with Groups, and social workers in the U.S. Army, Navy, and Air Force. Social work sections of conferences sponsored by multidisciplinary associations, such as the American Association for Mental Retardation and the American Public Health Association, also cover specialized areas of practice.

Research-based presentations at the major social work conferences are limited in scope. Analyses of programs at the 1989 and 1990 NASW Professional Conferences and CSWE Annual Program Meetings indicate that only about 10% of the presentations were research-based or dealt with research methodology. The gap between academic research and professional practice is illustrated by the absence of practitioners at the CSWE Annual Program

Meetings and by the limited presence of academic researchers at the NASW Professional Conferences. A representative sample of all NASW members reported that they had attended more non-social work conferences (2.3) than social work conferences (1.6) in 1989.

The Task Force study of social work doctoral graduates provided information about patterns of conference presentation (Section III). Although the respondents were only slightly more likely to present papers at social work conferences (mean=7.3) than at non-social work conferences (6.7), the rate of presentations at non-social work conferences was twice as great for 1980s graduates as for 1960s graduates. Presentations at social work conferences by 1980s graduates were less frequent than presentations by earlier graduates.

Professional journals include those published by NASW, CSWE, schools of social work, and national associations of service agencies, such as the Child Welfare League of America and Family Service America. In addition, at least two major commercial publishers now offer journals specializing in social work practice. Of these journals, *Social Work, Social Work Research and Abstracts,* and *Social Service Review* were reported by teachers of research and NASW researchers to be the most widely used to obtain research-based information. These three journals also were reported to have the highest citation impact of any social work journals (Lindsey & Kirk, 1991). Data from the Task Force study of doctoral graduates indicate that 1980s graduates have markedly higher publication rates in non-social work journals than in social work journals. Moreover, the Task Force review of publication patterns in 15 social work journals (see Appendix B) indicated that there was little real growth in the number of research-based articles published in social work journals during the 1980s, even though the total number of journals increased.

With the exception of the abstracts section of *Social Work Research and Abstracts,* social work journals consist almost entirely of full-length articles that reflect academic criteria for peer-reviewed publications. Most of the research-based articles result from a single research study, and publication occurs 1 to 3 years after completion of the research. Few practice-focused research review articles, research summaries, or notes on research in progress appear in social work journals.

The sample of NASW members reported that few professional practitioners read these journals on a regular basis. *Social Work,* which is received as a NASW membership benefit, was the only journal of any type reported to be read on a regular basis by as many as 30% of NASW members. Other social work journals were read on a regular basis by only 5% or less of NASW members. One third of NASW members reported that they read a non-social work journal of some kind on a regular basis. About 60% to 70% reported that they had read at least one social work research report, one report about a practice intervention, or one non-social work research report during 1989 in order to acquire information that was relevant to their professional practice.

In short, the profession has few public forums for presenting research results. Moreover, social work journals publish little in the way of research-based studies that contribute to the knowledge base of the profession. Nevertheless, teachers of research in schools of social work depend primarily upon these journals for examples of social work research. The scholarly publication and presentation needs of doctoral graduates—60% of whom are in academic positions—are only partially met by existing social work journals and conferences. Recent doctoral graduates present much of their research results at non-social work conferences and in non-social work journals. The individual social work practitioner, however, is not likely to have ready access to the full range of journals and computerized data bases through which such information is available.

Continuing Education

Continuing education programs and staff development programs are important channels for disseminating information. The sample of NASW members reported that they had participated in an average of five in-service training programs during 1989. Continuing education workshops are offered primarily by schools of social work and state chapters of NASW. In response to an inquiry from the Task Force, 26 graduate schools of social work reported sponsoring continuing education programs. Analysis of program listings revealed that almost all were clinical in nature; that is, they focused on direct practice issues, assessment, and intervention strategies. Several examined social policy issues. While a few of the programs reported on "some research findings," the vast majority did not introduce findings from original research.

Eighteen NASW chapters reported that they had sponsored continuing education programs during the same period. The overwhelming majority of these programs, too, were clinical in nature. None involved original research studies, and only three were concerned with research education.

Textbooks

The textbooks that are used to teach professional practice methods are a critical means of disseminating research findings. As reported in Section II, an analysis of widely used textbooks indicates that, with one exception, very limited use is made of specific information from social work research studies or from research in collateral professions and disciplines (see Appendix B).

Field-of-Practice Associations and Information-Sharing Networks

Many associations have been organized in conjunction with specialized fields of practice in social work. Almost one half (47%) of the sample of NASW members reported that they also belonged to another national professional association. The Task Force identified 39 such associations, including special-interest associations among faculty members in schools of social work. In addition, there are at least 14 multidisciplinary associations with substantial numbers of social work members (see Appendix C).

Eleven field-of-practice associations responded to an inquiry from the Task Force about ways of improving research contributions to practice. Many

sponsor their own conferences or publications for members, but these activities do not generally bring faculty researchers and social work practitioners together into information-sharing networks. Field-of-practice associations also do not participate regularly in the processes that determine the content of conferences and publications sponsored by NASW and CSWE. There are limited provisions for field-of-practice associations to meet as interest groups at the NASW Professional Conference. In contrast, CSWE has begun to provide symposia and networking sessions for special-interest associations of faculty at its annual meetings.

Among the important channels for dissemination of research findings are information-sharing networks among researchers who work in a given area. Such networks may consist primarily of social workers, or they may be multidisciplinary, such as the emerging network of researchers concerned with the prevention of mental illness. Networks that bring researchers and practitioners together are important for the development of research-based knowledge for practice. Although information sharing is unusual among social work researchers and practitioners in many fields of practice, the child welfare-family preservation field is one in which such a network is emerging. Some social work researchers participate in multidisciplinary networks, as indicated by their patterns of publication and conference participation and, in some instances, by their participation in specialized computer bulletin board networks. NASW and CSWE provide only limited support for research-oriented networks, and there is no national source of information about the existence of such networks.

PROBLEMS IN RESOURCES FOR RESEARCH DISSEMINATION AND UTILIZATION

There are numerous problems that limit the dissemination and utilization of research-based information.

- There are serious gaps in communication among the major centers of research (that is, graduate schools of social work), social service agencies, and individual practitioners.

- The primary channels of communication in the profession—journals and conference proceedings—do not make the products of social work research sufficiently visible or accessible to practitioners.

- Existing channels of dissemination are used primarily by faculty members.

- The usefulness of research is judged more on the basis of academic criteria than practice criteria.

- Continuing education programs offer little research-based information or information pertaining to the use of research methods by practitioners.

- Social work field-of-practice associations have little impact on NASW and CSWE professional conferences or publication policies. Moreover, faculty

researchers are minimally involved with field-of-practice associations and their dissemination mechanisms.

• Information-sharing networks among researchers are rare. Individual researchers must depend upon formal publication and conference channels which usually entail substantial delays in the transmission of information about current research projects and new findings.

CHALLENGES AND RECOMMENDATIONS

These problems in research dissemination and utilization present formidable challenges to the profession. To improve the knowledge base of the profession and strengthen the contributions of social work to the solution of critical social problems, it is important that action be taken. The recommendations set forth below will require action by the National Association of Social Workers (NASW), the Council on Social Work Education (CSWE), and individual schools of social work. Some of these recommendations will require organizational initiatives that are described in more detail in Section V.

CHALLENGE: Strengthen professional practice in social work through NASW initiatives to improve the dissemination of research-based information.

• NASW, through an Office for the Advancement of Social Work Practice, should:

provide brokering services between researchers and a range of research audiences, including practitioners, policymakers, program administrators, teachers, public and private funding sources, and the media;

promote the dissemination of research findings in forms that are usable by policymakers and the general public;

develop procedures for disseminating research reports and published research papers to the media throughout the country; and

recognize and reward contributions made to the profession by research and promote such recognition on the part of the larger society.

• NASW should affirm the principle that the primary rationale for publication of its professional journals is the dissemination of practice-relevant, research-based information to practitioners and students.

• NASW journals should publish increased numbers of empirical research-based articles that address issues of professional practice, including direct service, program design, and policy, in order to increase recognition of the importance of research to practice.

• NASW should develop user-friendly publications and other forms of communication that augment the existing scholarly journals. Research newsletters

should be created to translate, summarize, and highlight the relevance of current research for practice.

• NASW should publish annual reviews of social work research that offer comprehensive analyses of research in selected areas.

• NASW should introduce a feature section in the *NASW NEWS* that reports on research which can be of use to social work practitioners.

• NASW should offer at each Professional Conference sessions that are devoted to the empirical analysis of social work practice and programs. Members of field-of-practice associations and persons from allied professions and disciplines should be encouraged to participate.

• NASW should offer empirical research-based continuing education workshops and in-service training programs through its state and local chapters. These programs should summarize research findings that are relevant for practice and should teach research methods and tools that can be applied by practitioners in agency settings.

CHALLENGE: Strengthen professional practice in social work through CSWE initiatives to improve the dissemination of research-based information.

• CSWE should give high priority at its Annual Program Meeting to presentations based on empirical research and should encourage participation by members of field-of-practice associations and persons from allied professions and disciplines.

• CSWE should establish poster sessions for research presentations at its Annual Program Meeting.

• CSWE should publicize research opportunities, announcements, and reports in the exhibits at Annual Program Meetings.

• CSWE, through the Commission on Accreditation, should require that textbooks for practice method courses be based to the fullest extent possible on research-based knowledge from social work and allied professions and disciplines. It should establish a system for evaluating widely used textbooks. In doing so, it should draw upon teams of experienced practitioners and research scholars.

CHALLENGE: Strengthen professional practice in social work through initiatives by schools of social work to improve the dissemination of research-based information.

• Faculty members should take increased responsibility for incorporating research-based information in the teaching of practice methods.

• Schools of social work should offer continuing education and in-service training programs that are based on empirical research. These programs should summarize research methods and tools that can be applied by practitioners in agency settings.

The improvement of professional practice requires that existing mechanisms for research dissemination be expanded and new mechanisms be developed. This is one means for strengthening the institutional supports for research development in social work, the subject of Section V.

SECTION V

SUPPORT SYSTEMS FOR RESEARCH IN SOCIAL WORK

> Every profession must systematically carry out high-quality research about its practices if its performance in the service of clientele is to remain effective and up to date. . . .The volume and quality of research carried out to support the activities of the social work profession and the purposes of social welfare are the collective responsibility of the profession and not just of a small bank of researchers (Fanshel, 1980, pp. 3, 16).

CURRENT STATUS

Social workers can be found in a far wider array of service organizations today than 20 years ago. These include community mental health centers, child welfare and family preservation agencies, nursing homes, centers for older adults, and employee assistance programs in business firms. The number of social work education programs, including doctoral programs, has grown steadily in the last 20 years, as have the number and size of national associations concerned with social work education and social work practice. There has also been an increase in federal support for some areas of research that affect social work practice, such as biomedical research on mental disorders.

Nonetheless, there is growing concern within the profession that neither the organizational support nor the funding support needed for research development will be available in the future. This concern is reflected, in part, by the initiatives of the national professional associations which led to the formation of the Task Force on Social Work Research. Formal organizational support within the profession for research development is extremely limited. Federal funds for social and behavioral research were reduced substantially during the past decade. Current federal funds for research on critical social work practice issues are concentrated within a single agency, the National Institute of Mental Health (NIMH). Notably absent in social work research funding are links between for-profit industries and social service organizations. Such industries have been a major source of support for research and research dissemination in many other professions.

Potential national sources of increased support for research development in social work are the national professional associations, NIMH and other federal research agencies, foundations, and national associations of service agencies. Local sources of support include social work education programs and service agencies. This section examines the current status of organizational and funding support for research and research training. It then identifies critical problems and proposes actions to address those problems.

National Professional Associations

Two national bodies have been central to the development of social work as an organized profession. One is the National Association of Social Workers (NASW), which consists of individual professional members organized into state chapters. The other is the Council on Social Work Education (CSWE), an association of undergraduate and graduate social work education programs. Other significant national associations do not have full-time support staffs. These include the National Association of Deans and Directors of Schools of Social Work (NADD), the Association of Baccalaureate Program Directors (BPD), and the Group for the Advancement of Doctoral Education (GADE).

Both NASW and CSWE are organized in such a way that their constituents (that is, state chapters and social work education programs) determine policy and national program priorities. Because the interests of these constituents tend to be local rather than national, shared concerns, such as research development, tend to be outweighed by individual concerns. Common concerns are addressed only intermittently by means of small commissions and ad hoc task forces.

Neither organization has a component that is responsible for supporting the development of research or research education as a common objective of the profession. Moreover, limited attention has been given to the contributions of individual researchers. The President's Award for Excellence in Research, recently established by NASW, is the first evidence of such recognition on the part of the social work profession at the national level. The National Center for Social Policy and Practice, which is affiliated with NASW, is responsible for gathering information about existing social work research and making it available within the profession and to external groups. It has had a very limited role, however, in supporting the development of new research initiatives within the profession. NASW has provided support for the development of an innovative psychosocial assessment instrument that is being designed for both clinical and research applications.

National field-of-practice associations do not have a systematic role in national program and policy development nor in priority setting for the profession. NASW has established a formal procedure for collaboration with these associations, but they do not take part in organizational decision making. Field-of-practice associations are a potential resource for strengthening the linkages between research and practice in specialized settings.

NASW and CSWE do not provide advanced research training or development opportunities for individual researchers on a regular basis, although they do offer several specialized research training sessions in conjunction with their annual professional meetings. Few continuing education programs offer research training for practitioners or researchers.

National Institute of Mental Health

Most interaction between the social work profession and the federal government occurs under the auspices of the U.S. Department of Health and Human

Services (DHHS). Social work's major interests within DHHS are in the "health/mental health" and "human services" program areas. Of all DHHS departments, those in the area of health provide the most substantial research funding. Health-related research funding is provided through such agencies of the Public Health Service (PHS) as the National Institutes of Health (NIH) and the Alcohol, Drug Abuse, and Mental Health Administration (ADAMHA).

The most consistent and substantial base of support for social work research and for the development of research training in social work has been NIMH, which is part of ADAMHA. Social work was designated as one of the four core mental health professions in the legislation that established NIMH. Initial NIMH funding for professional education was directed primarily toward clinical training programs in social work and the other three mental health professions, namely, psychology, psychiatry, and psychiatric nursing. With the passage of the National Service Research Act (NSRA), NIMH funds for research training were distributed separately from funds for clinical training. The effect was to link support for research training to NIMH national research objectives.

NIMH funding of research and training for research in mental health includes grants to multidisciplinary centers, institutional support grants, and individual grants to researchers and to pre- and postdoctoral students. Funds for research training are provided primarily under NRSA and are administered by each of the institutes of NIH and by the organizational units of ADAMHA in accordance with their respective research priorities. Hence, research training proposals from social work and other professions must be responsive to the problem-solving priorities of these units.

The allocation of research awards within NIMH and other agencies in ADAMHA and NIH is determined largely by Initial Review Groups (IRGs), including both standing IRGs and special IRGs. These review panels are composed substantially of researchers whose own studies have been funded by these agencies and whose disciplinary backgrounds, therefore, reflect past patterns of research allocations. This has resulted in a self-perpetuating pattern of membership in which the majority of members on NIMH panels are affiliated with medicine, biomedical specialties, and psychology. Very few social workers have ever served on a standing IRG and only slightly more have served on special IRGs.

Like other federal agencies that have a specific mission, NIMH targets its research funding toward priority problems rather than toward broad support for investigator-initiated studies. Funding for research and research training in the 1990s is likely to be guided by policy initiatives established in the late 1980s. These include the Decade of the Brain plan and the National Plan for Schizophrenia Research (both of which emphasize fundamental biomedical research), the National Plan for Research on Child and Adolescent Mental Disorders, and the National Plan for Research to Improve Services, which is directed at caring for people with severe mental disorders. The development of a national plan for prevention research in mental health is currently under

way. There was no participation by social work researchers in the development of plans related to the Decade of the Brain, and only minimal participation in the development of the reports and research plans concerning schizophrenia and child and adolescent mental disorders. However, there was substantial involvement of social workers in development of the National Plan for Research to Improve Services for persons with severe mental disorders.

Both the NIMH plan for research on child and adolescent disorders and the plan for research to improve services for people with severe mental disorders emphasize clinical research that deals with treatment programs and services research concerning the organization of programs. These plans highlight the importance of expanding the available pool of researchers who have both practice experience and specialized research training.

NIMH established the Public-Academic Liaison (PAL) program in 1989 to promote collaboration between academic researchers and service agencies concerned with mental disorders. Recent policy developments at NIMH and other federal health research agencies also emphasize the importance of the development and support of multidisciplinary research centers which can more effectively develop the complex research that is needed.

One of the most recent NIMH initiatives is the program on mental health services research within the Division of Applied and Services Research. This program funds five centers of research which are examining the organization and financing of mental health services. One such center is cosponsored by a school of social work. Two other NIMH centers that are associated with schools of social work study consumer support groups for persons with severe mental illness.

The NIMH Division of Clinical Research is responsible for supporting both psychosocial and psychopharmacological research. The Division of Clinical Research has awarded only a limited number of research grants to principal investigators who are social workers.

From 1980 through 1989, NIMH grants for research and for pre- and postdoctoral research training programs were made to 18 graduate schools of social work. Five schools of social work received funds for predoctoral research training in the latter part of the 1980s: the University of California, Berkeley; the University of Michigan; the University of Chicago; Columbia University, and Brandeis University. Twelve social work predoctoral students are currently being supported by NIMH fellowships.

The pattern of approvals and disapprovals for research and research training proposals submitted to NIMH by social work researchers and schools of social work has varied over the years. There was a decrease in proposal submissions and approvals in the mid-1980s, but an increase occurred in submissions, approvals, and funding authorizations in 1989 and 1990. Altogether, 503 research proposals were submitted to NIMH in the 1980s from schools of social

work or from principal investigators who were identified as social workers. Of these, 246 were approved and 119 were funded. The proportion of grant proposals approved and paid was similar to the proportions approved involving other research disciplines. Factors influencing the approval of grants from year to year include the research priorities of NIMH, the total number of applications, the review criteria applied by IRGs, the presence or absence of social workers on review panels, and the quality of the proposals submitted. One half of the approved research grants to social workers were to sources outside of schools of social work, including other academic units and service agencies.

Although NIMH has supported occasional conferences for established researchers, it has not funded regular research development workshops. There is one NIMH staff person with formal responsibility for working with schools of social work to administer mental health clinical training grants. Although individual NIMH staff members have provided substantial assistance to individual schools of social work, there is no formal staff position within NIMH with responsibility for working with schools of social work and other social work research settings to promote research development. Few schools of social work or individual social work researchers have ever submitted applications to NIMH for career research development grants.

Few of the staff members responsible for research development or research review procedures at NIMH (or at any other federal research funding agency) have a social work background. This may be due to the relatively small number of research proposals in which a social work researcher is the principal investigator. This, in turn, perpetuates the pattern of a limited number of social workers on the staff of research agencies.

Other Federal Agencies

Other health-related federal agencies that have funded studies by social work researchers are the National Institute on Aging, the National Institute on Alcohol Abuse and Alcoholism, the National Institute on Drug Abuse, the Maternal and Child Health Program, and the Agency for Health Care Policy and Research. The National Science Foundation has also granted a few research awards to social work researchers.

The Administration for Children and Families in DHHS encompasses several agencies that support service programs in which social workers are heavily involved. These include the Administration on Children, Youth, and Families; the Children's Bureau; the National Center on Child Abuse and Neglect; the Family Support Administration; and the Administration for Developmental Disabilities. However, these agencies have not funded programs of research training or development since the early 1970s. Under current policies, their research funds are used principally to support technical assistance centers, short-term program innovations or demonstrations, and direct service training and development. Limited funds are provided for child welfare professional training under Section 426 of Title IV-B of the Social Security Act. However,

these funds are not currently used to support doctoral education. A 1991 announcement does, however, provide for 1-year grants for doctoral dissertation research and, for the first time in several years, for a small program of field-initiated research.

Given the diversity of social work practice, many other departments of the federal government are potential sources of research funding. These include the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention of the Department of Justice, the Food Stamp Program administered by the Food and Nutrition Service of the U.S. Department of Agriculture, the National Institute on Disability and Rehabilitation Research of the Department of Education, the Health Care Financing Administration of DHHS, and the Department of Housing and Urban Development. At present, however, there are no systematic programs of support for social work research training or development under the aegis of any of these agencies.

The Department of Defense—through the Army, Navy, and Air Force—enables selected officers, including social workers, to obtain doctoral research education. It has also supported studies by social work researchers of issues that affect military families. The Department of Veterans Affairs (VA), the largest single employer of social work practitioners, has established its own support system for social work research and research training. The Social Work Service of the VA is emphasizing the use of research in social work practice and is providing increased research training for master's degree students in social work practicums in its hospitals.

Foundations

Several major foundations are interested in social work practice. The Annie E. Casey Foundation, the Casey Family Foundation, and the Edna McConnell Clark Foundation are concerned with child welfare and family preservation. The Rockefeller Foundation supports research on issues of urban poverty. The Ford Foundation has supported work on the development of innovative career paths in the public social services. The Pew Foundation funds research about family self-sufficiency through the American Public Welfare Association, and it helps to support the development of collaborative research between state mental health agencies and academic research centers through the Research Institute of the National Association of State Mental Health Program Directors.

There are no national data on the scope of research funding from local sources. Nevertheless, researchers in schools of social work have acquired support from family and corporate foundations and from community foundations. In general, local foundations have less formal processes of grant application and faster response times than national foundations; hence, they are often attractive funding sources for researchers. However, local foundations tend to be more interested in social work research that has immediate local applications than in research that contributes to the knowledge base of the profession.

Schools of Social Work

Most research in social work during the past three decades has been based in schools of social work. Most funded research projects are housed there and most research-based publications in social work are authored by faculty. Yet, information from deans and directors of social work education programs indicates that research is regarded largely as an intellectual activity of individual faculty members and that it is shaped more by the demands and expectations of the larger university than by the commitment of the school of social work to strengthening the knowledge base of the profession.

Requirements for tenure are a powerful incentive for faculty members to undertake research; yet, most schools of social work have only limited resources for supporting the development of research careers among junior faculty. These resources consist largely of released time from teaching. Significant financial support for junior faculty research is rarely available from either schools of social work or other university sources. Furthermore, schools of social work do not reserve any faculty positions expressly for researchers who have long-term research funding; such positions do exist in other parts of the university, such as medical schools and departments of economics, psychology, and sociology.

Few schools of social work have ongoing research partnerships with community service agencies, in marked contrast to the research relationships that have been developed among medical schools, nursing schools, and teaching hospitals. The absence of established research partnerships means that individual scholars in schools of social work often must establish new collaborative, administrative, and support structures for research on professional practice issues before they can submit a research proposal. The organizational problems encountered in establishing such research partnerships add substantially to the difficulties that confront the individual researcher who hopes to develop a practice-focused research career. In general, schools of social work do not participate in multidisciplinary research studies within their universities, nor do they participate in multisite, nationwide research studies to test new forms of treatment, program structure, or policy.

The resources available for research and the structure of research support vary considerably among universities and schools of social work. These variations are reflected in current patterns of research productivity. Six patterns of research support and research productivity have been identified from information provided by the schools of social work:

1. Graduate schools with doctoral programs in which faculty members participate in multidisciplinary research centers or in multidisciplinary research studies. Funds are available for core operational costs of the research, as well as for specific investigations. The results of the research are disseminated by means of conferences and journals other than traditional social work outlets. Various forms of pre- and postdoctoral research training are funded. Several faculty members regularly buy out time for research. Discussions with federal

research consultants are reported as generally helpful. The doctoral graduates from these schools have a relatively high rate of scholarly productivity.

2. Graduate schools with doctoral programs in which senior faculty members have established clear and consistent research careers. These faculty members have acquired research funds from a variety of sources over a number of years, even though formal research support mechanisms are scarce or absent within their own school. Federal research consultants are seldom used. Many of these faculty members demonstrate consistent patterns of scholarship, including conference presentations, published articles, and chapter and book publications. Relatively little multidisciplinary research occurs in these schools. Nevertheless, the doctoral graduates from these schools have a high rate of scholarly productivity.

3. Graduate schools with doctoral programs that have recently increased organizational support for research development. University and school resources are employed to support initial research development, particularly among junior faculty members. Participation in conferences is encouraged. A few federal research awards have been obtained, but most research support comes from state and local sources. Financial support is available for doctoral students. Doctoral graduates of these schools achieve a moderate level of scholarly productivity which is expressed more frequently through conference presentations than through publications.

4. Graduate schools with doctoral programs that report a moderate level of research activity. Funding is primarily from state and local governmental sources and private foundations. Federal research consultants are seldom sought, and most of the research and research training proposals submitted to federal agencies have not been funded. Research is disseminated primarily through conference presentations rather than publications in peer-reviewed journals. Little effort is made to seek federal funds, and little attention is given to research support. Contacts with federal research staff are not viewed as very helpful. The most active faculty researchers are not well known beyond the local community or region. Doctoral graduates from these schools report a moderate level of scholarly productivity.

5. Graduate schools with doctoral programs that report limited research activity, most of which is funded by local sources. Published articles and conference presentations by faculty members generally are not research-based. Little attention is given to research support. Buying out teaching time tends to be viewed unfavorably by other members of the faculty. Limited research content is evident in the doctoral program, and doctoral graduates report a low level of scholarly productivity.

6. Schools that do not offer doctoral education. Only one or two faculty members are actively involved in research studies that receive steady funding, and they have a consistent record of conference presentations and research publications. Their colleagues do little research and are not highly represented in conference presentations or in peer-reviewed publications.

The Task Force found that among the 48 schools with doctoral programs, 10 to 12 schools would fit categories 1 and 2, an additional 10 to 15 would fit categories 3 and 4, and approximately half the schools with doctoral programs would fit category 5. Some schools do not fit readily into any of these categories.

The patterns of research support are very uneven among schools of social work. In part, this may be a result of variations in financial resources in the school or in the college or university. In part, it may be a result of differences in the traditions of the school or in the expectations of their college or university. And in part, it may be a consequence of the choices made by individual faculty members. There are, however, substantial resources within schools of social work for expanding the scope of research that contributes to the knowledge base of the profession if a more systematic approach to research development and support is adopted.

National, State, and Local Service Agencies

The Task Force has identified 13 national associations of social service programs. Of these, the Child Welfare League of America, Family Service America, and the American Public Welfare Association (APWA) have research departments. They support research initiatives by local and state agencies, as well as national research agendas. The Research, Development, and Evaluation Conferences of APWA pay particular attention to research studies within state and county public welfare departments. The National Association of State Mental Health Program Directors has established a Research Institute with funding support from NIMH. The Institute provides leadership for a national effort to strengthen research within state mental health agencies, including the development of Public-Academic Liaison research proposals for NIMH. None of these national associations of service agencies, however, have ongoing relationships with research units at schools of social work.

A number of service agencies, governmental and nongovernmental, have social work researchers on their staffs; however, they are responsible primarily for administrative and programmatic research that results in internal reports. Few service agencies have created researcher/practitioner positions that would allow agency-based researchers to participate on multidisciplinary teams that study issues related to the agency's mission.

Some service organizations, however, have established national reputations as exemplary centers for social work research. These include the Benjamin Rose Institute in Cleveland and the Philadelphia Geriatric Center (gerontology); Mt. Sinai Hospital and the Memorial Sloan-Kettering Cancer Center in New York City (health); and Bellefaire in Cleveland and Boysville of Michigan (residential care for children).

The Task Force study of a sample of NASW members found little support for research in the agencies in which respondents were employed. Only 10% of the respondents stated that the rewards for research at their agency were "very

attractive" or "moderately attractive," while 49% reported that they were "not attractive." Respondents also reported few jobs for social work researchers/practitioners within these service agencies.

The Task Force believes that researcher/practitioner positions, with a combination of research and practice objectives, are essential to bridge the gap that now exists between the world of academic research and the world of practice. Some institutions have already begun to close this gap. The Jewish Board of Family and Children's Services of New York City and the Columbia University School of Social Work, for example, cosponsor the Center for the Study of Social Work Practice. Other partnerships offer joint agency/faculty appointments for researchers. Examples of such partnerships are those between the School of Social Work at the University of North Carolina and Duke University Medical Center and the North Carolina Hospital.

PROBLEMS IN RESEARCH SUPPORT

At present, the infrastructure of social work research is too weak and too narrow to support the extensive expansion needed to improve services. Specifically:

- Neither NIMH nor any other federal agency has an organizational unit that supports the development of social work research that addresses critical social problems.

- There is a disturbing gap between the major centers of research development in schools of social work and the larger body of professional practitioners and agency-based researchers; in part, this mirrors the organizational separation that exists between CSWE and NASW.

- Few social work researchers serve on NIMH Initial Review Groups (IRGs), and even fewer participate in other research funding agencies of the federal government.

- Federal agencies with responsibilities in such critical areas as child abuse services and services to low-income families do not have a research development strategy or any systematic means for supporting research training and development.

- Support for practice-relevant research and research career development varies widely among schools of social work.

- There are few ongoing academic/service agency partnerships to provide a framework for practice-relevant research; individual faculty members find that the difficulties and uncertainties involved in developing collaborative arrangements are a major barrier to practice-relevant research.

- The lack of linkages among schools of social work militates against the multisite testing that is needed for new treatment interventions, program structures, and social policies.

CHALLENGES AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The weakness of organizational and funding supports for social work research poses a severe problem for the profession. If the knowledge base of the profession is to be improved and the contribution of social work to the solution of critical social problems strengthened, effective action must be taken. The recommendations that follow call for substantially increased organizational and funding support for research development from national associations and schools of social work, as well as from the National Institute of Mental Health and other federal agencies.

CHALLENGE: Strengthen support for social work research through the National Institute of Mental Health (NIMH).

- NIMH should establish an Office for Social Work Mental Health Research Development that would develop and implement a plan for expanding research resources in areas of social work that deal with NIMH priorities. A Social Work Advisory Committee should be appointed by the national professional associations in social work to consult with NIMH in the development of this plan. The plan should include the following elements:

  a program of Social Work Research Development Center (SWRDC) awards. Each award would provide:

  flexible funding for a 5-year program to develop organizational infrastructure for mental health research, with $200,000 to $500,000 per year in funds for each center for each of 5 years; and

  support for at least one related individual research development project per center.

Each Social Work Research Development Center would be organized around a pressing NIMH concern in mental health research, such as mental health services for individuals with severe mental disorders; child and adolescent mental health services; culturally relevant mental health services for individuals and families from Hispanic, African American, Asian-Pacific Islander, and Native American backgrounds; mental health services in rural communities; and comorbidity services for persons suffering from both mental illness and substance abuse.

A minimum of 10 such centers should be established during fiscal years 1992 and 1993, with additional centers in succeeding years. The centers should be developed by schools of social work, or by a consortium of schools and service agencies, in collaboration with public mental health service agencies, and should include persons from other relevant academic departments and professional schools. The centers should also provide research opportunities for individual faculty researchers from other academic settings and for researchers/practitioners from service agencies. Each award would include support for both institutional research development and for individual research projects:

research development could include support for technical equipment and staff; participation by faculty members in advanced seminars in research methodologies; initial research, including pilot projects; participation by researchers/practitioners from public mental health service agencies in the development of research programs; research assistantships for predoctoral and postdoctoral students; collaboration with senior scientists from other professions and disciplines; and intensive research development workshops involving center researchers and researchers from other institutions working in similar areas. Funds would also be used to attract pre- and postdoctoral students and faculty from African American, Hispanic, Native American, and Asian-Pacific Islander backgrounds to the centers. The intent of the research development component is to strengthen the research capabilities of schools of social work and thus the research capability of individual faculty and researchers/practitioners; and

one or more Individual Investigator Research Projects should be linked to each center's development plan. The size and scope of the individual projects would depend on the developmental needs of the projects. Projects would be expected to involve collaboration with experienced researchers from other disciplines. The intent of this component is to support individual research initiatives leading to successful applications for research project grants or small grant awards.

• NIMH should fund a 15-month mental health research methodology workshop for researchers with intensive summer sessions in 1992 and 1993 and interim meetings during the winter of 1992-93.

• NIMH should appoint at least two social work researchers to each standing Initial Review Group (IRG) that reviews research or training proposals submitted by social workers or social work education programs.

CHALLENGE: Strengthen support for social work research through other federal agencies.

• The Department of Health and Human Services, through the Administration for Children and Families, should develop a long-term plan for research development and support that focuses on services to children, youths, and families; this plan should be similar to the national plans for research development in mental health.

CHALLENGE: Strengthen research support through the national professional associations in social work.

> . . . NASW must organize a consciousness of the critical nature of research among its members, develop organizational supports to facilitate research activities by its members, and lobby for a larger public investment in social welfare (Fanshel, 1980, p. 17).

• A National Institute for the Advancement of Research in Social Work should be established with the support of national professional associations in social work. The initial organization of the Institute should be supported by a grant of $500,000 from NIMH. The objectives of the Institute would be to:

establish a program of intensive research development workshops in areas of particular concern to NIMH for researchers in academic and service settings;

provide technical assistance to schools of social work in the design and preparation of research and research training proposals;

establish a program to promote the development of research partnerships among schools of social work and service agencies;

develop a national plan for research career recruitment, including specialized research education at the master's degree level, summer workshops, and affiliations with mentors;

develop a national social work research and research training data base;

organize periodic meetings among national social work groups, national associations of service agencies, and schools of social work in order to identify critical research issues, review current developments in research, and identify sources of research funding;

establish research development partnerships with allied professional and academic disciplines such as psychology, medicine, nursing, pharmacology, economics, and political science;

serve as a liaison between the profession and federal research funding organizations in the development of research initiatives that address critical issues in social work practice;

encourage and support the development of information-sharing networks among social work researchers, both practice-based and university-based; and

stimulate the development of computer networks among researchers and maintain a directory of those networks.

• The Research Institute should be supported by professional associations in social work, including the National Association of Social Workers, the Council on Social Work Education, the National Association of Deans and Directors of Schools of Social Work, the Group for the Advancement of Doctoral Education, and the Association of Baccalaureate Program Directors.

• NASW should establish an Office for the Advancement of Social Work Practice to:

initiate a sustained national program to educate the profession about the emerging crisis in social work research and the importance of research to the future strength, advancement, credibility, and influence of the profession;

develop working relationships with major research funding sources;

advocate for increased federal appropriations to study professional interventions aimed at critical social problems. Specifically, it should promote NIMH funding for implementation of the National Plan for Research on Child and Adolescent Mental Disorders and the National Plan to Improve Services for Persons with Severe Mental Disorders, and it should promote the work of other research institutes within the Alcohol, Drug Abuse, and Mental Health Administration, the National Institutes of Health, agencies of the Administration for Children and Families, and other federal departments, such as the Department of Education and the Department of Labor;

create a national program that increases the visibility of social work research and provides access to data bases on social work researchers, research products, and information-sharing networks. Such a service should give priority to the information needs of individual practitioners and service program administrators;

initiate regular research workshops and working conferences that bring together social work practitioners and researchers. These should address practice and research issues in a wide range of practice areas and also include researchers from related fields;

establish working relationships with field-of-practice associations and service agency associations in order to address issues of research development;

recommend peer reviewers for ADAMHA and NIH and promote the participation of social work researchers from academic and service backgrounds in federal research review and approval processes;

support proposals for a 1% set-aside in all federal programs to foster research concerning program effectiveness and improvement, as well as proposals that require research and evaluation in all service programs; and

promote the development of targeted research initiatives by national foundations that deal with critical social problems.

• NASW should strengthen research contributions to practice by appointing two career researchers as members of each of its Practice Commissions.

• CSWE should establish an Office for the Advancement of Research in Social Work to:

promote and facilitate research education and research development within social work education programs;

provide information to social work education programs about models of effective research development;

establish, together with NADD and GADE, a 10-year program to double the number of schools of social work that have active programs of faculty research;

develop, in cooperation with GADE and NADD, guidelines for research education in social work doctoral programs;

develop plans to strengthen research education in baccalaureate and master's degree programs;

serve as a clearinghouse for materials to be used in the design of research training curriculums; and

distribute information on research training through newsletters and other dissemination channels.

• CSWE should request social work education programs to prepare a yearly report on funded research programs, identifying research topics, funding sources, and principal investigators.

CHALLENGE: Strengthen support for social work research through social work education programs.

• Social work education programs should ensure that practice-relevant research and dissemination of the results of such research are essential elements of their institutional mission.

• Universities and colleges, in collaboration with social work education programs, should fund technical assistance and research support activities that enable such programs to achieve their dual missions of knowledge building and teaching.

• Universities and colleges, in collaboration with social work education programs, should ensure that resources, such as reduced teaching loads, funds for conference travel, research leaves, and released time from teaching, are readily available in the early stages of research development.

• Social work education programs should take the initiative in developing ongoing research partnerships with community service agencies. They should provide technical assistance about research problems, while collaborating agencies should make available research opportunities for students and faculty. Service agencies should also be encouraged to collaborate with research institutes and centers.

• Social work education programs should make clear their support for practice-relevant research by making appropriate adjustments in faculty work loads.

• Social work education programs should provide support specifically for the development of research careers by beginning faculty members and encourage them to participate in multidisciplinary, long-term research.

• Social work education programs should increase significantly the attention given to research-based knowledge in the teaching of practice methods and to the use of research methods to examine practice effectiveness.

• Social work education programs should strive to develop multidisciplinary research initiatives that address critical issues in the areas of social policy, social work practice, and program design.

• Social work education programs and service agencies should support the development of career opportunities for researchers/practitioners and should recognize the research contributions of such individuals.

• Social work education programs should encourage the development of research information-sharing networks among their own faculty members, faculty from related academic departments, and professional personnel in service agencies.

• Schools of social work should establish research scientist positions for researchers who have long-term funding. These research scientists would conduct major studies related to the needs of practitioners, provide advanced research training for pre- and postdoctoral students, and exert national leadership in research development.

CHALLENGE: Strengthen support for social work research through service agencies and national associations of service agencies.

• National associations of service agencies should promote practice-relevant research and dissemination of the research findings as essential elements of their institutional mission.

• National associations of service agencies should encourage and support the participation of local agencies in research partnerships with schools of social work.

• Executives of state and local service agencies should promote practice-relevant research and dissemination of the research findings as essential elements of their institutional mission.

• Executives of state and local service agencies should promote the establishment of agency-based researcher/practitioner positions. Researchers/ practitioners should work with researchers in social work education programs to formulate and implement research that deals with practice issues.

Organizational and funding support for social work research has not kept pace with the profession's expanding role in society or its growing need for information. Section VI summarizes the recommendations of the Task Force in the form of a comprehensive plan of action for research development.

SECTION VI

A. PLAN OF ACTION FOR SOCIAL WORK RESEARCH DEVELOPMENT

Social workers cannot deal effectively with the complex problems this society faces unless they have better information about what works and why. Research can provide this information. But current support for social work research is inadequate to meet present, much less future, needs for information. Clearly, a dynamic and wide-ranging plan of action is required in order to expand and strengthen social work research. In this section, the Task Force brings together its recommendations to create such a plan of action. The plan requires action by the National Institute of Mental Health and other federal agencies, by national associations in social work, by individual social work education programs, and by service agencies at both national and local levels.

THE NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF MENTAL HEALTH (NIMH)

Social work is one of the core mental health professions. Research in social work can contribute directly to the effectiveness of mental health services and to the knowledge base for training practitioners in all of the mental health professions. For these reasons, NIMH should provide support for research development in social work that is comparable to the support it has provided for research development in other mental health professions.

- NIMH should establish an Office for Social Work Mental Health Research Development that would develop and implement a plan for expanding research resources in areas of social work that deal with NIMH priorities. A Social Work Advisory Committee should be appointed by the national professional associations in social work to consult with NIMH in the development of this plan. The plan should include the following elements:

  a program of Social Work Research Development Center (SWRDC) awards. Each award would provide:

  flexible funding for a 5-year program to develop organizational infrastructure for mental health research, with $200,000 to $500,000 per year in funds for each center for each of 5 years; and

  support for at least one related individual research development project per center.

Each Social Work Research Development Center would be organized around a pressing NIMH concern in mental health research, such as mental health services for individuals with severe mental disorders; child and adolescent

mental health services; culturally relevant mental health services for individuals and families from Hispanic, African American, Asian-Pacific Islander, and Native American backgrounds; mental health services in rural communities; and comorbidity services for persons suffering from both mental illness and substance abuse.

A minimum of 10 such centers should be established during fiscal years 1992 and 1993, with additional centers in succeeding years. The centers should be developed by schools of social work, or by a consortium of schools and service agencies, in collaboration with public mental health service agencies, and should include persons from other relevant academic departments and professional schools. The centers should also provide research opportunities for individual faculty researchers from other academic settings and for researchers/practitioners from service agencies. Each award would include support for both institutional research development and for individual research projects:

> research development could include support for technical equipment and staff; participation by faculty members in advanced seminars in research methodologies; initial research, including pilot projects; participation by researchers/practitioners from public mental health service agencies in the development of research programs; research assistantships for predoctoral and postdoctoral students; collaboration with senior scientists from other professions and disciplines; and intensive research development workshops involving center researchers and researchers from other institutions working in similar areas. Funds would also be used to attract pre- and postdoctoral students and faculty from African American, Hispanic, Native American, and Asian-Pacific Islander backgrounds to the centers. The research development component is to strengthen the research capabilities of schools of social work and thus the research capability of individual faculty and researchers/practitioners; and
>
> one or more Individual Investigator Research Projects should be linked to each center's development plan. The size and scope of the individual projects would depend on the developmental needs of the projects. Projects would be expected to involve collaboration with experienced researchers from other disciplines. The intent of this component is to support individual research initiatives leading to successful applications for research project grants or small grant awards.

• NIMH should develop an expanded research career recruitment program, under the auspices of an Office for Social Work Mental Health Research Development, which would:

> increase support for predoctoral research training fellowships in social work. Social work requires a substantial expansion of training at the predoctoral level, both to meet the immediate need for researchers and to provide a base for expanding specialized postdoctoral research training;

increase stipends for predoctoral students in an effort to recognize their graduate education and professional experience in social work. Current regulations used to determine the level of stipend support for predoctoral fellows under the National Research Service Act (NRSA) do not recognize the social work student's graduate education, several years of professional experience, and, often, significant family financial responsibilities;

support the development of specialized postdoctoral research programs in schools of social work;

issue pre- and postdoctoral research training announcements highlighting opportunities for master's degree and doctoral graduates in social work;

create dissertation grants for research in NIMH priority areas, with stipends of $25,000 per year for up to 2 years and up to $25,000 for research expenses.

• A multiyear plan for substantially increasing the number of career researchers in social work who are engaged in mental health research that would:

create a 15-month mental health research methodology workshop with intensive summer sessions in 1992 and 1993 and interim meetings during the winter of 1992-93;

set up specialized conferences for faculty researchers and researchers/practitioners that address specific NIMH priorities and represent academic/agency collaborations;

promote the First Independent Research Support and Transition (FIRST) awards;

promote the Scientist Development Award for Clinicians that is available for social workers who have substantial clinical experience and who want to conduct research on mental health issues that are related to social work practice;

create within 4 years a K-12 career development program in social work similar to the K-12 program in psychiatry;

promote the Research Scientist Development Award and the Research Scientist Award; and

establish an intensified research career development program directed toward persons with master's degrees and professional experience who come from Hispanic, Asian-Pacific Islander, African American, and Native American backgrounds. These efforts should include stimulating applications for Minority Access for Research Careers (MARC) faculty grants,

First Independent Research Support and Transition (FIRST) awards, individual postdoctoral fellowships, and the Scientist Development Award for Clinicians (SDAC).

• NIMH should triple its current financial support for the Social Work Minority Fellowship program administered by CSWE.

• NIMH should appoint at least two social work researchers to each standing Initial Review Group (IRG) that reviews research or training proposals submitted by social workers or social work education programs.

PROFESSIONAL ASSOCIATIONS IN SOCIAL WORK

Research development requires concerted action by the major associations in social work and social work education. The Task Force recommends that:

• A National Institute for the Advancement of Research in Social Work should be established with the support of national professional associations in social work. The initial organization of the Institute should be supported by a grant of $500,000 from NIMH. The objectives of the Institute would be to:

establish a program of intensive research development workshops in areas of particular concern to NIMH for researchers in academic and service settings;

provide technical assistance to schools of social work in the design and preparation of research and research training proposals;

establish a program to promote the development of research partnerships among schools of social work and service agencies;

develop a national plan for research career recruitment, including specialized research education at the master's degree level, summer workshops, and affiliations with mentors;

develop a national social work research and research training data base;

organize periodic meetings among national social work groups, national associations of service agencies, and schools of social work in order to identify critical research issues, review current developments in research, and identify sources of research funding;

establish research development partnerships with allied professional and academic disciplines such as psychology, medicine, nursing, pharmacology, economics, and political science;

serve as a liaison between the profession and federal research funding organizations in the development of research initiatives that address critical issues in social work practice;

encourage and support the development of information-sharing networks among social work researchers in academic settings and service agencies;

stimulate the development of computer networks among researchers and maintain a directory of those networks; and

prepare, together with NASW and CSWE, specific proposals for research development workshops in connection with the NASW Professional Conference and the CSWE Annual Program Meeting.

• The Research Institute should be supported by professional associations in social work, including the National Association of Social Workers, the Council on Social Work Education, the National Association of Deans and Directors of Schools of Social Work, the Group for the Advancement of Doctoral Education, and the Association of Baccalaureate Program Directors.

The National Association of Social Workers (NASW)

• NASW should establish an Office for the Advancement of Social Work Practice to:

initiate a sustained national program to educate the profession about the emerging crisis in social work research and the importance of research to the future strength, advancement, credibility, and influence of the profession;

develop working relationships with major research funding sources;

advocate for increased federal appropriations to study professional interventions aimed at critical social problems. Specifically, it should promote NIMH funding for implementation of the National Plan for Research on Child and Adolescent Mental Disorders and the National Plan to Improve Services for Persons with Severe Mental Disorders, and it should promote the work of other research institutes within the Alcohol, Drug Abuse, and Mental Health Administration, the National Institutes of Health, agencies of the Administration for Children and Families, and other federal departments, such as the Department of Education and the Department of Labor;

create a national program that increases the visibility of social work research and provides access to data bases on social work researchers, research products, and information networks. Such a service should give priority to the information-sharing needs of individual practitioners and service program administrators;

initiate regular research workshops and working conferences that bring together social work practitioners and researchers. These should address

practice and research issues in a wide range of practice areas and also include researchers from related fields;

establish working relationships with field-of-practice associations and service agency associations in order to address issues of research development;

recommend peer reviewers for ADAMHA and NIH and promote the participation of social work researchers from academic and service backgrounds in federal research review and approval processes;

support proposals for a 1% set-aside in all federal programs to foster research concerning program effectiveness and improvement, as well as proposals that require research and evaluation in all service programs;

promote the development of targeted research initiatives by national foundations that deal with critical social problems;

provide brokering services between researchers and a range of research audiences, including practitioners, policymakers, program administrators, teachers, public and private funding sources, and the media;

promote the dissemination of research findings in forms that are usable by policymakers and the general public;

develop procedures for disseminating research reports and published research papers to the media throughout the country; and

recognize and reward contributions made to the profession by research and promote such recognition on the part of the larger society.

• NASW should strengthen research contributions to practice by appointing two career researchers as members of each of its Practice Commissions.

• NASW should affirm the principle that the primary rationale for publication of its professional journals is the dissemination of practice-relevant, research-based information to practitioners and students.

• NASW journals should publish increased numbers of empirical research-based articles that address issues of professional practice, including direct service, program design, and policy, in order to increase recognition of the importance of research to practice.

• NASW should develop user-friendly publications and other forms of communication that augment the existing scholarly journals. Research newsletters should be created to translate, summarize, and highlight the relevance of current research for practice.

• NASW should publish annual reviews of social work research that offer comprehensive analyses of research in selected areas.

• NASW should introduce a feature section in the *NASW NEWS* that reports on research which can be of use to social work practitioners.

• NASW should offer sessions at each Professional Conference that are devoted to the empirical analysis of social work practice and programs. Members of field-of-practice associations and persons from allied professions and disciplines should be encouraged to participate.

• NASW should offer empirical research-based continuing education workshops and in-service training programs through its state and local chapters. These programs should summarize research findings that are relevant for practice and should teach research methods and tools that can be applied by practitioners in agency settings.

The Council on Social Work Education (CSWE)

• CSWE should establish an Office for the Advancement of Research in Social Work to:

promote and facilitate research education and research development within social work education programs;

provide information to social work education programs about models of effective research development;

establish, together with NADD and GADE, a 10-year program to double the number of schools of social work that have active programs of faculty research;

develop plans to strengthen research education in baccalaureate and master's degree programs;

develop, in cooperation with GADE and NADD, guidelines for research education in social work doctoral programs;

serve as a clearinghouse for materials to be used in the design of research training curriculums;

distribute information on research training through newsletters and other dissemination channels;

develop a national strategy to recruit and support an increased number of doctoral students from African American, Hispanic, Native American, and Asian-Pacific Islander backgrounds; and

seek funding from a consortium of national foundations to support doctoral students who are interested in research concerning social work practice and critical social problems.

- CSWE should request social work education programs to prepare a yearly report on funded research programs, identifying research topics, funding sources, and principal investigators.

- In its next Curriculum Policy Statement, the CSWE Commission on Educational Policy should:

  recognize the importance of research education and the production of practice-relevant research in the educational mission of baccalaureate and master's degree programs; and

  recognize the importance of recruiting students who are interested in research and of advising students about research career pathways in social work that can link research education at the baccalaureate, master's, and doctoral levels.

- The accreditation standards of the CSWE Commission on Accreditation should be strengthened to:

  support the development of adequate research competencies by all students in baccalaureate and master's degree programs;

  require accreditation review teams to pay specific attention to the quality of research teaching and the integration of research experiences into all aspects of the baccalaureate and master's degree curriculums;

  promote increased linkage between research teaching and practice methods teaching;

  require that all areas of the foundation curriculum, including practice methods, be based on knowledge derived to the fullest extent possible from research in social work and from related professions or disciplines; and

  establish expectations for research competency on the part of practicum instructors.

- CSWE, through the Commission on Accreditation, should require that textbooks for practice method courses be based to the fullest extent possible on research-based knowledge from social work and allied professions and disciplines. It should establish a system for evaluating the research content of widely used textbooks. In doing so, it should draw upon teams of experienced practitioners and research scholars.

• CSWE should give high priority at the Annual Program Meeting to presentations based on empirical research and should encourage participation by members of field-of-practice associations and persons from allied professions and disciplines.

• CSWE should establish poster sessions for research presentations at its Annual Program Meeting.

• CSWE should publicize research opportunities, announcements, and reports in the exhibits at Annual Program Meetings.

• CSWE should request schools of social work to prepare a yearly report about their funded research programs, identifying research topics, funding sources, and principal investigators.

Group for the Advancement of Doctoral Education in Social Work (GADE)

• GADE, in cooperation with NADD, should develop guidelines for the enhancement of research training in doctoral programs, including mechanisms for assessing the quality of doctoral programs and identifying the resources required to establish and maintain quality. It should make this information available to universities with doctoral programs in social work and universities that are considering such programs.

Association of Baccalaureate Program Directors (BPD)

• BPD should support the strengthening of research education in baccalaureate programs through faculty development workshops, consultations, and faculty exchanges among baccalaureate and master's degree programs.

National Association of Deans and Directors of Schools of Social Work (NADD)

• NADD should support the strengthening of research education in master's degree programs through faculty development workshops, consultations, and faculty exchanges among master's degree programs.

• NADD, in cooperation with GADE, should develop guidelines for enhancement of research training in doctoral programs, including mechanisms for assessing the quality of doctoral programs and identifying the resources required to establish and maintain quality.

American Association of State Social Work Boards (AASSWB)

• AASSWB should be urged to increase the proportion of questions on licensing examinations for baccalaureate graduates that deal with research methodology and the ability to understand research reports.

• AASSWB should be urged to increase the proportion of questions on licensing examinations for master's degree graduates that deal with research methodology, the ability to understand research reports, and the ability to use research procedures to evaluate professional practice.

OTHER FEDERAL AGENCIES

Support for research training and research development should also come from federal agencies other than NIMH that are responsible for service programs in fields of social work practice.

• The Administration for Children and Families, U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, should establish a long-term plan for the support of doctoral research education, research career development, and research support that focuses on research dealing with children, youths, families, and persons with developmental disabilities.

• Institutes in the National Institutes of Health (for example, the National Institute on Aging), as well as the National Institute on Drug Abuse and the National Institute on Alcoholism and Alcohol Abuse, should develop systematic programs of support for research career development in areas of social work that coincide with their research priorities.

• The Department of Veterans Affairs (VA) should increase the opportunities for social workers to participate in VA research training fellowships and senior research fellowships.

SOCIAL WORK EDUCATION PROGRAMS

Social work education programs are responsible for strengthening research education and research development on the most fundamental level—through the curriculums of baccalaureate and master's degree programs, through doctoral education, through their support and encouragement of faculty researchers, and through the development of research partnerships with service agencies.

Baccalaureate and Master's Degree Programs

• Baccalaureate social work programs should:

increase significantly the attention given to research-based knowledge in the teaching of practice methods and to the use of research methods to examine practice effectiveness;

emphasize the importance of using and producing research that is related to social work practice;

provide opportunities for all students to participate directly in research activities, including academic-based research projects, research projects in practicums, and summer research experiences;

train all students in the use of computers so they can access software programs and data bases that support practice and research activities; and

recruit students who are interested in a research career and provide them with opportunities for a specialized practicum that includes research experiences.

- Instruction in research methods in baccalaureate degree programs should focus on the competencies to be expected of baccalaureate degree graduates. At least the following should be expected:

  ability to define practice issues in research terms;

  ability to search for and locate research studies relevant to specific practice problems and to employ a variety of computerized data bases;

  ability to comprehend and critically evaluate the validity and reliability of research studies;

  ability to apply in practice research findings that are relevant to assessment, planning, intervention, implementation, and practice evaluation;

  ability, under supervision, to use research tools in practice and to evaluate the quality and effectiveness of one's own practice; and

  ability to contribute to the implementation of research activities in service agencies.

- Master's degree social work programs should:

  increase significantly the attention given to research-based knowledge in the teaching of practice methods and to the use of research methods to examine practice effectiveness;

  emphasize the importance of using and producing research that is related to social work practice;

  provide opportunities for all students to participate directly in research activities, including academic-based research projects, research projects in practicums, and summer research experiences;

  train all students in the use of computers so they can access software programs and data bases that support practice and research activities; and

  recruit and advise students who are interested in a research career and provide them with opportunities for either an advanced practice concen-

tration in research which emphasizes the research/practice connection, or a research-intensive practicum.

• Master's degree programs should include in their admission information the expectation that applicants will have had undergraduate courses in statistics and research methods or be prepared to take a placement examination in these curriculum areas.

• Instruction in research methods in master's degree programs should focus on the competencies to be expected of master's degree graduates, including the following:

ability to define practice issues in research terms;

ability to retrieve from a variety of computerized data bases research studies relevant to specific problems in the student's area of advanced practice;

ability to comprehend and evaluate critically the validity and reliability of research studies;

ability to apply in practice research findings that pertain to assessment, planning, intervention, implementation, and practice evaluation;

ability to use research skills independently to evaluate one's own practice effectiveness;

ability to serve as a research team member and to apply quantitative and qualitative technical skills in research design and analysis;

ability to teach supervisees how to use research methods and findings; and

in master's degree programs that offer a concentration in research, the ability to assume responsibility, under supervision, for research design and proposal preparation.

• Baccalaureate and master's degree programs should make use of the NIMH Minority Access to Research Careers (MARC) program for early identification of persons interested in research careers, including intensive summer workshops and mentoring relationships with active researchers, and the Supplements for Underrepresented Minorities in Biomedical and Behavioral Research Support by ADAMHA.

• Baccalaureate and master's degree programs should encourage faculty to infuse research content and skills into the professional curriculum by:

giving faculty released time from teaching duties to take additional instruction in research;

increasing recognition of faculty research productivity and of faculty initiatives to engage students in research; and

designing programs of in-service research training for practicum instructors, as well as opportunities for them to participate in collaborative school/agency research initiatives.

Doctoral Degree Programs

• Schools of social work with doctoral programs and those considering doctoral programs and their universities should examine issues of quality and effectiveness in doctoral programs, the resources required for developing and maintaining a strong doctoral research program, and the resources available for support for full-time doctoral students.

• Schools of social work should strive to recruit doctoral students earlier in their professional careers.

• Schools of social work should experiment with combined master's/doctoral programs for individuals who have a strong undergraduate background in research. Such programs should include provisions for an extended practice residency during the precandidacy period or following the completion of requirements for candidacy.

• Schools of social work should provide sufficient financial support to make full-time study feasible for all precandidacy doctoral students.

• Schools of social work should be encouraged to use research assistant positions in RO 1 research grants to support predoctoral students at financial levels that are consistent with their educational and professional backgrounds.

• Schools of social work should support the option of a postdoctoral appointment for doctoral graduates prior to appointment as a junior faculty member.

• Schools of social work, in cooperation with the NIMH Office for Social Work Mental Health Research Development, should make special efforts to recruit and retain doctoral students from ethnically diverse backgrounds. These efforts should include provisions for intensive summer research workshops and for affiliations with research mentors.

• Schools of social work should be urged to make use of resources available through the NIMH MARC program and the Minority Fellows program to support doctoral students from African American, Hispanic, Native American, and Asian-Pacific Islander backgrounds.

• Schools of social work should be encouraged to use Supplements for Underrepresented Minorities in Biomedical and Behavioral Research Support and the provisions of the Minority Institution Research Development Program (MIRDP).

• Doctoral programs should increase the rigor and sophistication in their teaching of research methods and analytic techniques and in their application of these techniques to the study of practice-related issues.

• Doctoral programs should employ more researchers from other academic departments to teach specialized research procedures that are applicable to practice.

• Doctoral programs should require hands-on research experiences throughout the course of study, including research practicums, research internships, and research assistantships.

• Doctoral programs should provide students with the knowledge and skills that are essential for obtaining research support.

• Doctoral programs should apply stringent admission standards and should require master's-level research competency as a prerequisite for admission.

• Regardless of their specific program objectives, all doctoral programs in social work should adopt the following expectations for research competencies:

ability to select and apply complex research designs;

ability to select and apply sophisticated statistical tools, including multivariate and causal modeling techniques;

ability to design and execute independently complex research studies, including experimental and quasi-experimental designs, organizational, program, and policy analyses, and qualitative field studies; and

ability to write competitive research proposals in the student's specialized research area(s).

• Post-master's degree education programs that include social work students should give greater attention to research training and to opportunities for students to participate in multidisciplinary research.

Research Support

• Social work education programs should ensure that practice-relevant research and dissemination of the results of such research are essential elements of their institutional mission.

• Universities and colleges, in collaboration with social work education programs, should fund technical assistance and research support activities that enable such programs to achieve their dual missions of knowledge building and teaching.

• Schools of social work, and the colleges and universities in which they are located, should develop faculty research career policies and procedures that promote growth in practice-relevant research and in the scientific knowledge base of the profession.

• Universities and colleges, in collaboration with social work education programs, should ensure that resources, such as reduced teaching loads, funds for conference travel, research leaves, and released time from teaching, are readily available in the early stages of research development.

• Social work education programs should take the initiative in developing ongoing research partnerships with community service agencies. They should provide technical assistance about research problems, while collaborating agencies should make available research opportunities for students and faculty. Service agencies should also be encouraged to collaborate with research institutes and centers.

• Social work education programs should make clear their support for practice-relevant research by making appropriate adjustments in faculty work loads.

• Social work education programs should provide support specifically for the development of research careers by beginning faculty members and encourage them to participate in multidisciplinary, long-term research.

• Social work education programs should increase significantly the attention given to research-based knowledge in the teaching of practice methods and to the use of research methods to examine practice effectiveness.

• Social work education programs should strive to develop multidisciplinary research initiatives that address critical issues in the areas of social policy, social work practice, and program design.

• Social work education programs and service agencies should support the development of career opportunities for researchers/practitioners and should recognize the research contributions of such individuals.

• Social work education programs should encourage the development of research information-sharing networks among their own faculty members, faculty from related academic departments, and professional personnel in service agencies.

• Schools of social work should establish research scientist positions for researchers who have long-term funding. These research scientists would conduct major studies related to the needs of practitioners, provide advanced research training for pre- and postdoctoral students, and exert national leadership in research development.

• Schools of social work and social service agencies should create jobs for teachers/researchers and researchers/practitioners.

• Schools of social work should make maximum use of available minority supplements to include such researchers in existing federally funded research projects.

• Faculty members should take increased responsibility for incorporating research-based information in the teaching of practice methods.

• Schools of social work should offer continuing education and in-service training programs that are based on empirical research. These programs should summarize research methods and tools that can be applied by practitioners in agency settings.

SERVICE AGENCIES

• National associations of service agencies should promote practice-relevant research and dissemination of the research findings as essential elements of their institutional mission.

• National associations of service agencies should encourage and support the participation of local agencies in research partnerships with schools of social work.

• Executives of state and local service agencies should promote practice-relevant research and dissemination of the research findings as essential elements of their institutional mission.

• Executives of state and local service agencies should promote the establishment of agency-based researcher/practitioner positions. Researchers/ practitioners should work with researchers in social work education programs to formulate and implement research that deals with practice issues.

• Service agencies, including teaching hospitals, nonprofit agencies, state departments of human services, and departments of mental health, should provide research practicum experiences for doctoral students.

Concerted action on the part of social work education programs, professional associations, service organizations, and federal research agencies to strengthen research resources in social work can dramatically increase the scope and power of the body of knowledge used by social work practitioners. In turn, improvements in effectiveness in professional practice can significantly improve the quality of life for untold numbers of Americans and strengthen their capacity to confront the critical social problems which today impact the lives of individuals, families, and communities. The Task Force believes that the recommendations set forth here constitute a very modest investment that can yield immense benefits for our society.

REFERENCES

Abbott, A.A. (1985). Research productivity patterns of social work doctorates. *Social Work Research & Abstracts, 21*(3), 11-17.

American Psychiatric Association. (1991, March). The future of psychosocial treatment research. *Psychiatric Research Report, 6* (1), 1.

Association of Graduate Schools in the Association of American Universities. (1990). *Institutional policies to improve doctoral education* (A Report to the Association of American Universities). Washington, DC: Author.

Bloom, M., & Fischer, J. (1982) *Evaluating practice: Guidelines for the accountable professional.* Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Bok, D. (1990). *Universities and the future of America.* Durham, NC: Duke University.

Boyer, E.L. (1990). *Scholarship reconsidered: Priorities of the professoriate.* Princeton, NJ: Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching.

Briar, S. (1985, April). *Doctoral research and social work practice.* Paper presented at the National Symposium on Doctoral Research and Social Work Practice. Columbus, OH.

Brill, N. (1990). *Working with people: The helping process.* New York: Addison-Wesley.

Compton, B., & Galaway, B. (1984). *Social work processes.* Homewood, IL: Dorsey Press.

Council on Social Work Education. (1974). *Curriculum policy statement.* Alexandria, VA: Author.

Council on Social Work Education. (1988). *Curriculum policy statement.* Alexandria, Va: Author.

Crow, R.T., & Kindelsperger, W. (1975). The ph.d. or the d.s.w.? *Journal of Education for Social Work, 11*(3), 38-43.

Fanshel, D. (Ed.). (1980). *Future of social work research.* Washington, DC: National Association of Social Workers.

Fraser, M., & Taylor, M.J. (1990). [An assessment of the literature in social work: Utah project]. Unpublished raw data.

Fraser, M.W., Lewis, R.E., & Norman, J. L. (1989, March). *Research education in m.s.w. programs: Four competing perspectives.* A paper presented at the Annual Program meeting of the Council on Social Work Education, Chicago, IL.

Glisson, C. (1990). [A systematic assessment of the social work literature: Trends in social work research, part 2]. Unpublished raw data.

Goldman, J.J. (1990, August 7). University rated 'f' for inability to help solve society's problems. *Los Angeles Times,* p. A-5.

Hepworth, D.H., & Larsen, J. (1982). *Direct social work practice: Theory and skills.* Homewood, IL: Dorsey Press.

Institute of Medicine, National Academy of Sciences. (1989). *Research on children and adolescents with mental, behavioral, and developmental disorders.* Washington, DC: Author.

LeCroy, C.S., & Goodwin, C.C. (1988). New directions in teaching social work methods: A content analysis of course outlines. *Journal of Social Work Education, 24*(1), 43-49.

Lindsey, D., & Kirk, S.A. (1991). *The role of social work journals in the development of a knowledge base for the profession.* Unpublished manuscript.

Mizrahi, T. (1989, May). *The future of research utilization in community practice.* Paper presented at the Conference on Research Utilization: A Decade of Practice, Detroit, MI.

McMahon, M.O., Reisch, M., & Patti, R.J. (1991). *Scholarship in social work: Integration of research, teaching & service.* Washington, DC: National Association of Deans and Directors of Schools of Social Work.

National Institute of Mental Health. (1988). *A national plan for schizophrenia research: Report of the national advisory mental health council.* (DHHS Publication No. ADM 88-1571). Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.

National Institute of Mental Health. (1991). *Caring for people with severe mental disorders: A national plan of research to improve services.* (DHHS Publication No. ADM 91-1762). Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.

National Institute of Mental Health. (1990). *National plan for research on child and adolescent mental disorders.* (DHHS Publication No. ADM 90-1683). Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.

Sheafor, B.W., Horejsi, C.R., & Horejsi, G.A. (1988). *Techniques and guidelines for social work practice.* Newton, MA: Allyn and Bacon.

Shulman, L. (1979). *The skills of helping individuals and groups.* Itasca, IL: F.E. Peacock.

Task Force on Quality in Graduate Social Work Education. (1986). The pursuit of excellence in social work education. *Journal of Social Work Education, 22*(I), 74-86.

Waller, K.V., Jordan, L., Giehart, J., Brodnik, M.P., Schiller, M.R., Flanigan, K.S., Ballinger, P.W., Grant, H.K., Bennett, D., Van Son, L.G., & Testat, E.W. (1988). Research skills and the research environment: A needs assessment of allied health faculty. *Journal of Allied Health, 17,* 101-113.

Zastrow, C. (1981). *The practice of social work.* Homewood, IL: Dorsey Press.

APPENDIX A

TASK FORCE TIMELINE

October 1988 - Lewis L. Judd, MD, Director of the National Institute of Mental Health (NIMH), appointed members of the Task Force on Social Work Research.

October 6, 1988 - Lewis L. Judd, MD, Director of NIMH, addressed the Educators Symposium on Social Work Research sponsored by the Council on Social Work Education (CSWE), the Group for the Advancement of Doctoral Education in Social Work (GADE), and the National Association of Deans and Directors of Schools of Social Work (NADD), Columbus, OH. Focused on the role of research in the social work profession.

November 10, 1988 - Lewis L. Judd, MD, Director of NIMH, addressed a session of the National Association of Social Workers (NASW) Professional Conference, Philadelphia, PA. Focused on the role of research in the social work profession.

November 22, 1988 - First meeting of the Task Force, Washington, DC, with Lewis L. Judd, MD, Director of NIMH.

February 2-3, 1989 - Task Force meeting, San Diego, CA. General program of work developed.

March 1989 - Task Force dissemination of Information Summary I.

May 1989 - National Board meeting, National Federation of Societies for the Advancement of Clinical Social Work, Washington, DC.

June 2-3, 1989 - Task Force meeting, Austin, TX. Plans approved for five commissioned research projects and for subcommittee assignments.

July 1989 - Task Force Chair met with the Research Council of the National Association of Black Social Workers, Chicago, IL. Task Force dissemination of Information Summary II.

September 1989 - Task Force participation in Research, Development, and Evaluation Conference, APWA, in Washington, DC, and the NIMH Public/ Academic Linkages (PAL) Conference in Bethesda, MD.

October 1989 - Meetings with Group for the Advancement of Doctoral Education, Knoxville, TN, and Uniformed Services Social Workers, San Francisco,

CA. Task Force open meeting at NASW Professional Conference, San Francisco, CA.

November 3-4, 1989 - Task Force meeting, Washington, DC. Initial materials from subcommittees and reports on initial data gathering on research productivity.

November 1989 - NIMH Workshop on Social Work Research and Community-based Mental Health Services, Rockville, MD. Meeting with NADD, San Antonio, TX. Report to National Advisory Mental Health Council, NIMH, Washington, DC.

December 1989 - Task Force dissemination of Information Summary III.

January 1990 - Meetings with NASW Board, Tampa, FL, and NASW Commission on Health/Mental Health, Washington, DC.

February 2-3, 1990 - Task Force meeting, Berkeley, CA. Discussed final report structure and content.

February 1990 - Meeting with West Coast Hispanic Researchers, San Jose, CA. Task Force participation in the National Association of State Mental Health Program Directors' First Annual Conference on State Mental Health Services Research, Bethesda, MD, and the Child Welfare League of America Conference on Research, Washington, DC. Chair of Task Force met with the NASW Commission on Family and Primary Associations and the Executive Committee of the National Association of Public Child Welfare Administrators, Washington, DC.

March 1990 - Meeting with CSWE Board at the CSWE Annual Program Meeting, Reno, NV. Meeting with constituency groups, including: NADD, Hispanic Faculty Caucus, Black Faculty Caucus. Meeting with Family Service America, Directors of Professional Services, San Antonio, TX.

June 1-2, 1990 - Task Force meeting, Cleveland, OH. Discussed preliminary recommendations.

June 17-20, 1990 - Task Force Chair participated in Conference on Research on Prevention of Mental Disorders, Bethesda, MD.

September 1990 - Task Force dissemination of Information Summary IV.

October 2-3, 1990 - Task Force meeting, New York, NY. Draft chapters for final report prepared.

October 10-12, 1990 - Task Force Chair participated in GADE meeting, Minneapolis, MN.

November 1990 - NADD meeting, Boston, MA. Task Force Networking Session at the NASW Professional Conference, Boston, MA. Meetings of the Task Force Chair with NASW Communications Commission and NASW Legislative Committee.

December 1990 - Hispanic Social Work Researchers Conference, San Jose, CA.

January 18, 1991 - Written progress report to NASW Board of Directors.

February 5, 1991 - Task Force Chair presented progress report to National Advisory Mental Health Council, Washington, DC.

February, 8-9, 1991 - Task Force meeting, Los Angeles, CA. Met with Alan I. Leshner, PhD, Acting Director of NIMH. Considered recommendations for draft report.

March 14-17, 1991 - Report to constituency groups in connection with CSWE Annual Program Meeting, New Orleans, LA. Groups included NADD, CSWE Board, GADE, Black Educators, Hispanic/Latino Educators, Asian-Pacific Islander Educators.

May 10-11, 1991 - Task Force meeting in Miami, FL. Discussed draft of final report.

July 9-10, 1991 - Final Task Force meeting, Washington, DC. Adopted final report.

September 1991 - Task Force dissemination of Information Summary V.

November 11, 1991 - Report of Task Force published.

APPENDIX B

ANNOTATED LIST OF STUDIES

Conducted by Task Force Staff

Survey of the Deans and Directors of Social Work Education Programs
Survey of Identified Research Centers
Survey of Research Faculty in MSW Programs
Survey of Research Faculty in BSW Programs
Content Analysis of BSW and MSW Research Course Syllabi
Survey of Social Work Faculty
Analysis of Social Work Faculty Curricula Vitae
Survey of Social Work Field Practicum Directors
Survey of NASW Members Identified as Researchers
Survey of Social Work All-But-Dissertation Doctoral Students
Research Support Patterns in Schools of Social Work
Analysis of Social Work Practice Textbooks
Continuing Education Programs: NASW Chapters and Schools of Social Work

Contract Studies

Mandated Opportunities for Social Work Researchers
Survey of NASW Membership
An Assessment of the Research Literature in Social Work, Part I
An Assessment of the Research Literature in Social Work, Part II
National Survey of Social Work Doctoral Graduates: Preliminary Findings
National Survey of Social Work Doctoral Graduates: The Research Productivity of Social Work Doctoral Graduates: 1960-1988
Qualitative Summary and Evaluation of Open-ended Question: National Survey of Social Work Doctoral Graduates
Survey of Research Training in Social Work Doctoral Programs

Survey of the Deans and Directors of Social Work Education Programs

From March through November 1989, a survey was conducted of deans and directors of undergraduate and graduate social work education programs. A total of 483 questionnaires were mailed; 227 usable responses were returned (48% response rate). Responses were received from 145 undergraduate programs and 82 graduate programs. The survey requested information about faculty and about research activities. This included a list of names of individuals who were considered full-time members of academic faculty, as well as the names of faculty members responsible for teaching research methods. Other information requested included: the number of funded research proposals between 1985 and 1988 and the subject areas of those proposals, the types of

support provided for research studies by faculty members, and identification of linkages with academic and nonacademic organizations involved in social work research.

Survey of Identified Research Centers

Between September 1989 and April 1991, a brief request for information was sent to research centers that were identified by the deans and directors of social work education programs and by others. The purpose of the questionnaire was to identify organizations involved in social work research activities, including research centers in schools of social work, research centers directed by social workers, and research centers that included social work researchers or that dealt with social work related topics. The questionnaire included a request for a description of the center; its scope of activities, including its methods of funding; a list of researchers on the staff and their most recent degree; a list of current research projects and those completed during the last program year, including the source(s) of funding for those studies; and a list of currently available research reports or publications. A total of 134 requests were mailed; 63 centers (47%) responded.

Survey of Research Faculty in MSW Programs

A survey questionnaire was mailed between June and October, 1989, to social work faculty identified as teachers of research methods in master's degree programs by the deans and directors of schools of social work. The questionnaire sought information about the current patterns of research teaching and the perceptions of research faculty about research instruction, including the use of professional social work journals as teaching tools in research methods courses, the inclusion (and examples) of a research component in the practicum, research textbooks used, information regarding the objectives of teaching research methods, and views about desirable changes in the research curriculum. The questionnaire included a request for a copy of the course syllabus used in the research methodology course taught. Of the 250 questionnaires mailed, 173 were returned (69% response rate).

Survey of Research Faculty in BSW Programs

In May 1989, a survey questionnaire was mailed to social work faculty members who were identified as teachers of research methods in undergraduate social work programs. The survey was intended to provide the Task Force with information about current patterns of research teaching and faculty perceptions regarding the quality of research instruction. The questionnaire also sought information on the structure of the undergraduate program; the use of professional social work journals as teaching tools in the research methods course; research textbooks used; perceptions of research faculty regarding content, objectives, and recommended changes in research methods in the undergraduate curriculum; and the role of research in the practicum. The survey also requested a copy of the most recent syllabus used in teaching the research methods course. A total of 200 surveys were mailed and 101 were returned (51% response rate).

Content Analysis of BSW and MSW Research Course Syllabi
Of the 274 responses received from teachers of research, 205 included a copy of the research course syllabus used. Analysis of the syllabi focused on inclusion of qualitative and quantitative methods, the content of research methods in courses, the inclusion of statistical content, and the textbooks used in teaching research methods. Course requirements were also analyzed.

Survey of Social Work Faculty
Between October 1989 and January 1990, a survey questionnaire was sent to 2,173 graduate and undergraduate social work faculty members. Faculty lists were provided by the deans and directors of social work education programs. A total of 922 (42%) usable responses were returned, including 230 responses from undergraduate social work faculty, 678 responses from graduate social work faculty, and 14 responses from medical school social work faculty. The questionnaire asked for information about teaching patterns, areas of research activities, utilization of social work journals, involvement and role in research in the past 5 years, primary research methods used, product(s) of research activities, forms of research support, percent of time bought out, and general demographics. A copy of a current curriculum vitae was also requested.

Analysis of Curricula Vitae of Social Work Faculty
A total of 644 curricula vitae were received as part of the larger survey of social work faculty. Of these, 382 reflected research activities between 1980 and 1989. Information regarding the respondent's educational level and background, research activities external to the school, products or results of research activities, writings about research methods, and participation in federal research funding panels was obtained from this source.

Survey of Social Work Practicum Directors
In February 1990, a questionnaire was sent to 493 deans and directors of social work programs, who were asked to give the request to practicum directors. Of the 210 (43%) returned, 163 were from undergraduate programs and 47 were from graduate programs. The questionnaire requested information on the structure of the field placement, inclusion of research in the practicum policy manual, methods and instruments used to instruct students in evaluation of practice, total number of students in the field in 1990, student involvement in research-related activities as part of practicum, research training for practicum instructors, application of research methods as part of student evaluation, research-based placements, number of students in these placements, availability and type of technical research assistance to practicum agencies, the role of research faculty in the design of the practicum and curriculum, and suggestions for improving the role of research in the practicum.

Survey of NASW Members Identified as Researchers
Using a list provided by the National Association of Social Workers, a survey of NASW members who had identified research as their primary professional activity was conducted in February 1990. A total of 485 questionnaires were mailed. Based on an adjusted total of 441 (subtracting the undeliverables from

the original total), 155 (35%) usable responses were returned. The purpose of the survey was to gather information about the production, utilization, and dissemination of research in social work settings, as well as information regarding individual career paths.The questionnaire asked for information regarding the type of organizational employment setting; the existence of a designated research department or unit, its function and funding source; linkages with academic institutions and the names of those institutions; products of the research activities of the organization; and internal and external means of disseminating research findings. Information regarding individual research activities, research career activities, and individual demographics was also gathered.

Survey of All-But-Dissertation Doctoral Students in Social Work

From May through July 1990, a survey questionnaire was mailed to a proportional random sample of social work doctoral students who had completed all requirements except the dissertation (ABD). Lists of ABD students were obtained from directors of social work doctoral programs. A total of 251 questionnaires were mailed and 156 (62%) were returned. The questionnaire requested information regarding research training and education, research content in doctoral education, future career plans, and individual demographics. Additional information about motivations for entering a social work doctoral program, factors affecting choice of a doctoral program, opportunities for participation in research while in the doctoral program, and dissertation research activities was also collected.

Research Support Patterns in Schools of Social Work

A request was sent in November 1990 to the deans and directors of schools of social work with doctoral programs asking for information about their experience in developing and supporting funded research activities. The original inquiry went to 55 schools of social work, including those with doctoral programs. A total of 22 (40%) schools responded. The inquiry included questions about experience with the federal research review process.

Analysis of Social Work Practice Textbooks

The following six social work practice textbooks were analyzed for contents reflecting both research methods and research findings:

Brill, N. (1990). *Working with people: The helping process* (4th edition). New York: Addison-Wesley.

Compton, B., & Galaway, B. (1984). *Social work processes* (3rd edition). Homewood, IL: Dorsey Press.

Hepworth, D. H., & Larsen, J. (1982). *Direct social work practice: Theory and skills.* Homewood, IL: Dorsey Press.

Sheafor, B.W., Horejsi, C.R., & Horejsi, G.A. (1988). *Techniques and guidelines for social work practice.* Newton, MA: Allyn and Bacon.

Shulman, L. (1979). *The skills of helping individuals and groups.* Itasca, IL: F.E. Peacock.

Zastrow, C. (1981). *The practice of social work.* Homewood, IL: Dorsey Press.

Continuing Education Programs: NASW Chapters and Schools of Social Work

To examine the nature of research education opportunities for practicing social workers through continuing education, a request for information was sent in June 1989 to 56 NASW state chapters and to 107 social work education programs. The request focused on continuing education programs sponsored from September 1987 through August 1988. Of the 64 (39%) responses, 20 were from NASW chapters and 44 from schools of social work. A list of all continuing education programs was composed and analyzed for research content.

Mandated Opportunities for Social Work Researchers. The National Center for Social Policy and Practice, Silver Spring, MD. Final report, October 1989 (contract study).

To determine what opportunities exist for social work research as a result of federal legislation, the National Center for Social Policy and Practice was commissioned by the Task Force to carry out an analysis of current federal legislation that provides research funding, mandates research and program evaluation in areas of concern to social workers, or provides for the education of social work researchers. The final report of the National Center for Social Policy and Practice provided a listing of current federal legislative provisions, outside of the National Institutes of Health, for the direct funding of research and research program training, or programmatic provisions requiring research.

Survey of NASW Membership (contract study).

A random sample of 2,200 NASW members was conducted in order to obtain information on current sources of professional income, professional practice activities, professional practice knowledge-building activities, current research training and education activities, and individual demographic information. Robert Harris, PhD, School of Social Work, Virginia Commonwealth University, prepared the survey instrument, data collection and data entry were conducted by the National Association of Social Workers, data analysis was carried out by Task Force staff. A total of 923 (42%) questionnaires were returned.

An Assessment of the Research Literature in Social Work, Part I. Mark Fraser, PhD, Principal Investigator, and Mary Jane Taylor, Project Director, University of Utah, Salt Lake City. Final report, May 21, 1990 (contract study).

The purpose of this two-part review of social work publications was to examine the degree to which social work publications are based on systematic research, what research methodologies characterize the social work literature, the subjects of the research, and whether or not the research methods used by social work researchers have changed over time. The following 10 journals were examined: *Administration in Social Work, Behavioral Research and Therapy, Child and Adolescent Social Work, Child Welfare, Journals of Gerontology, Social Work in Education, Social Work in Health Care, Social Work with Groups* (1985-1988), *The Journal of Sociology and Social Welfare, and Social Casework* (1977-1988).

An Assessment of the Social Work Literature: Trends in Social Work Research, Part II. Principal Investigator: Charles Glisson, PhD, College of Social Work, University of Tennessee, Knoxville. Final report, May 15, 1990 (contract study).
Part two of the review of social work publications to determine the nature of the research reported in the social work literature and to identify any changes in the research that had occurred in the previous 12 years. Part two reviewed articles published in five social work journals from 1977 through 1988. The five journals were *Journal of Social Service Research, Journal of Social Work Education, Social Service Review, Social Work,* and *Social Work Research and Abstracts.*

National Survey of Social Work Doctoral Graduates: Preliminary Findings. Presentation made for the Task Force on Social Work Research, Cleveland, OH. Robert G. Green, Principal Investigator, Elizabeth D. Hutchison, Co-Investigator, and Bibhuki K. Sar, Research Associate, School of Social Work, Virginia Commonwealth University, Richmond. Preliminary report, June 1, 1990 (contract study).
In January 1990, a 16-page questionnaire was mailed to 3,145 graduates of social work doctoral programs who had received their degree between 1960 and 1988. A total of 1,775 (64%) usable responses were returned, based on an adjusted number of 2,757 (after subtracting undeliverables and unusable responses).Presentation of preliminary findings included the response rate, individual demographic information, and research outcomes for graduates of social work doctoral programs (1960-1988). Also presented was background information on the survey, sample definition and selection of survey participants, questionnaire development and pretesting, and data collection.

National Survey of Social Work Doctoral Graduates: The Research Productivity of Social Work Doctoral Graduates: 1960-1988. Robert G. Green, Principal Investigator, Elizabeth D. Hutchison, Co-Investigator, and Bibhuki K. Sar, Research Associate, School of Social Work, Virginia Commonwealth University, Richmond. Final report, September 1, 1990 (contract study).
The objectives of this report were to describe research outcomes for 1,775 graduates of social work doctoral programs (1960-1988), identify a group of "productive researchers," and identify attributes which distinguish this "productive" group from others.

Qualitative Summary and Evaluation of Open-ended Question. Part II of the National Survey of Social Work Doctoral Graduates: The Research Productivity of Social Work Doctoral Graduates: 1960-1988. Robert G. Green, Principal Investigator, Mary K. Rodwell, Co-Investigator, and Wesley E. Pullman, Research Associate, School of Social Work, Virginia Commonwealth University, Richmond. Final report, January 1, 1991 (contracted study).
This report is a qualitative analysis of responses to the final item on the 16-page questionnaire completed by respondents to the National Survey of Social

Work Doctoral Graduates. The open-ended request was, "Please add any recommendations you have for the improvement of doctoral education in social work." A total of 783 responses were analyzed.

Survey of Research Training in Social Work Doctoral Programs. Mark W. Fraser, Principal Investigator, Jefferey M. Jenson, Co-Principal Investigator, and Robert E. Lewis, Co-Principal Investigator, Social Work Research Institute, University of Utah, Salt Lake City. Final report, May 21, 1990 (contract study).
Descriptive information about research training in social work doctoral programs was obtained through a mail survey and follow-up telephone interviews with directors of 47 social work doctoral education programs. These individuals were identified through the Group for the Advancement of Doctoral Education. Information collected included descriptive information on the doctoral program; research prerequisites; doctoral research and statistical course content, requirements, and teaching methods; dissertation and examination procedures; and faculty research and resources.

APPENDIX C

SOCIAL WORK ASSOCIATIONS AND INTEREST GROUPS

The following is a list of social work associations, national associations of service agencies, and multidisciplinary associations including social work that the Task Force identified during the course of their work. Those social work associations and national agency associations which had been identified prior to January 1, 1991, were sent letters asking for comments on a series of questions related to the development of research resources within social work. The asterisk indicates those associations which provided written responses to the questions. In other instances, there were telephone conversations with association officers.

Social Work Education Associations

Council on Social Work Education
- Commission on Minority Concerns
- Commission on the Role and Status of Women
- Commission on Lesbian Women and Gay Men

Association of Baccalaureate Program Directors
National Association of Deans and Directors of Schools of Social Work
Group for the Advancement of Doctoral Education in Social Work
Association on Community Organization and Social Administration
Social Welfare Policy and Policy Practice Group*
Hispanic/Latino Social Work Educators*
Asian-Pacific Islander Faculty Association
Black Social Work Educators
Social Welfare History Group*
Research Methods Interest Group*
Study Group for Philosophical Issues
National Committee for Gerontology in Social Work
Group for the Study of Generalist and Advanced Generalist Practice
Field Educators, Directors, and Field Instructors
Social Work Librarians

Field-of-Practice Associations

National Association of Black Social Workers, Research Council*
Federal Social Workers Consortium
National Association of Nephrology Social Workers
Society for Hospital Social Work Directors*
Social Work Division, American Association for Mental Retardation*
Social Work Group, Curriculum and Training Section, National Alliance for the Mentally Ill*

National Federation of Societies for Clinical Social Work
Social Work Section, American Public Health Association*
Association for the Advancement of Social Work with Groups
Symposium on the Empirical Foundations of Group Work
Bertha Capen Reynolds Society*
National Association of Perinatal Social Workers
National Network for Managers
National Association of Social Workers
- Commission on Family and Primary Associations
- Commission on Education*
- Commission on Employment and Economic Support*
- Commission on Health/Mental Health
- Black Caucus
- Latino Caucus
- Native American Caucus
- Asian American Caucus

Associations of Service Organizations
National Association of Homes for Children
Child Welfare League of America
Family Service America
United Way of America
International Association of Psychosocial Rehabilitation Services
America Public Welfare Association
- National Association of Public Child Welfare Administrators

Department of Veterans Affairs, Social Work Service*
Air Force Social Work Service*
Army Social Work Service
Navy Social Work Service
National Council on Aging*
National Assembly of National Voluntary Health and Social Welfare Organizations
National Council of Mental Health Centers

Multidisciplinary Associations
American Society on Aging
Gerontological Society of America
Association for Health Services Research
Orthopsychiatry Association
Employee Assistance Society of North America
Society of Teachers of Family Medicine
Mental Health Association of America, Prevention Coalition
National Association for Family-Based Services
National Consortium on Interprofessional Practice and Education
American Congress of Medical Rehabilitation
Adoption Researchers Network
Qualitative Family Research Network
American Association for Marriage and Family Therapy
American Association of Spinal Cord Injury Psychologists and Social Workers

Other
American Association of State Social Work Boards
National Institute for Clinical Social Work Advancement
American Board of Examiners in Clinical Social Work

Editorial & Production: Norris Loeffler, Austin, TX
Design & Production: Edward Triggs, Austin, TX
Typesetting Service: G & S Typesetters, Inc., Austin, TX
Printing: Capital Printing Co., Inc., Austin, TX